

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 546

SP 021 134

AUTHOR Brown, Diane, Ed.; And Others
TITLE Proceedings of Annual Oklahoma Conference on Education, "Public Education: Time to Speak Up!" (3rd, Oklahoma City, OK, September 8-9, 1981).
PUB DATE Sep 81
NOTE 68p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; Economic Development; *Educational Assessment; Educational Legislation; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); *Government School Relationship; Nontraditional Students; *School Districts; *School Support; *School Taxes; Sex Fairness; Student Attitudes; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Oklahoma

ABSTRACT

Speeches, panel discussions, and a debate from the 1981 Oklahoma Conference on Education are presented. The topics of the speeches are: (1) administrative decision making in institutions of higher education and the effects of state legislation (Barbara Uehling); (2) experiences of an American hostage in Iran and subsequent feelings about the American education system (William F. Keough); and (3) the financial status and local concerns of school districts (Vincent Reed). Excerpts from panel discussions are included, which deal with: (1) ad valorem taxes in Oklahoma; (2) educating the nontraditional student; (3) state government-mandated curriculum; (4) federal role in education; (5) achieving sex equity in education; (6) students' perspectives on high school and adult education; (7) the image of public education as presented in the media; (8) the role of education in economic development; and (9) staff development and teacher orientation. A debate on the merits of tuition tax credits versus a voucher system is included. Brief statements from Governor George Nigh, Senator Roger Randle, and Representative Jim Fried precede the conference material. (FG)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED221546

PROCEEDINGS OF THIRD ANNUAL OKLAHOMA CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Craddock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

September 8 - 9, 1981

SP 021 134



The Conference on Education offers a chance for us to speak up for public education. We are talking about what we are doing right in education in Oklahoma. Sure, there are some problems, but we are correcting them. We are making great steps forward, so let's not forget how far we have come.

You know, the public education system in Oklahoma is called upon to do an awful lot; it is supposed to teach the three R's, promote the ideals of democracy, strengthen the economy, stabilize the family, advance technology, enhance the arts and prevent disease. We want it to provide citizens with the opportunity to attain their full human potential. And the system has been pretty successful at doing all of this. Critics point out deficiencies and shortcomings in Oklahoma's public system, but everyone who wants an education can have it, all the way from kindergarten through vocational and academic training.

We cannot, however, let our accomplishments create complacency. We must study history to apply it to the present in order to affect the future. It is important that we all work together, using our past accomplishments as a foundation for dealing with problems of the present and future. The Conference provides an opportunity for education leaders and citizens to advise their elected representatives about the direction education should take. We must accentuate the positive, focus on the good things. If you search the world over and look at monuments that have been built you won't find any dedicated to a critic. They are dedicated to doers, builders and achievers. That is what we are trying to do, build Oklahoma.

Governor George Nigh



Oklahoma at seventy-five is unique because our frontier heritage is still much with us. There never has been a time in the history of Oklahoma when public education has been under attack as it is now. The system is being questioned all across the country. Here we argue among ourselves about education but not with our critics; we are at a crossroads of decision

about what we want an educational system to be. Seventy-five years from now it could be altogether different. It is time for supporters of public education to speak up to critics, for if we do not who will? We need to be aware of the times we are in, in light of the attacks being made. We need to unite to make public education safe for the future. Those who must speak up for public education are those who have dedicated their lives to education. Our State still lives a frontier philosophy and carries the values that are brought to Oklahoma - that of the individual realizing his or her potential. We should recognize where we are in history, the problems we have overcome, and what we can accomplish. Recently, there have been large dollar increases for schools indicating a commitment to education. The question is whether or not we will build on that commitment. Are we willing to be defenders of public education, to take the burden of being promoters and spokesmen for public education? Are we willing to build on a good foundation?

Senator Rodger Randle
Chairman of the Senate Appropriations
Committee



It is important that this Conference emphasize the positive attitude of education, for education in Oklahoma is a cooperative effort involving all of us. Leadership and commitment to education has been shown by Governor Nigh. It must also extend through the State Department of Education, the Legislature, local boards of education, and especially, be among parents. Commitment and what is positive should be stressed at this Conference. However, that does not mean we ignore areas of concern. We are aware of them. How they are addressed can be positive or negative. Positive response helps those of us in the Legislature mold legislation that is beneficial in the long run for all. Oklahoma presently is in a financial position to do much for education that other states cannot. What we must do is channel our resources and it must be a cooperative effort. My wish is that this Conference will be used to address issues that need to be addressed, that we will question old ways of doing things, and express opinion on how we might make changes for the good, so that when we leave the Conference we will be united in a commitment to make education in Oklahoma the very best system of education in America. We have the ability and the resources to do that.

Representative Jim Fried
Chairman of the House Education
Committee

1981 Oklahoma Conference on Education

Public Education: Time to Speak Up!

Sheraton Century Center

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

September 8-9, 1981

Table of Contents

Fulfilling Tomorrow's Responsibility While Balancing Today's Budget Dr. Barbara Uehling	1
Ad Valorem Taxes and Schools	8
Educating the Non-Traditional Student	12
Government Mandated Curriculum	14
Debate: Tuition Tax Credits/Voucher System	16
The Changing Federal Role in Education	21
Education for Unforeseen Circumstances Dr. William Keough	28
Achieving Sex Equity in Education	36
The Student's Perspective	38
The Communications Media and Education: Shaping the Public Attitude Toward Public Education	40
The Role of Education in Economic Development	44
Implementation of Staff Development and Entry-Year Teacher Program	50
Managing a School System Dr. Vincent Reed	52

Fulfilling Tomorrow's Responsibility While Balancing
Today's Budget

Dr. Barbara Uehling, Chancellor
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

My topic for today is "Fulfilling Tomorrow's Responsibility While Balancing Today's Budget". I was told that this was a group including several legislators, so some of my remarks will be directed to them. Obviously, I will be speaking, in large part, from the perspective of higher education, since I have spent my life in higher education. But I hope that you can apply many of these thoughts to whatever situation you are in and to whatever your beliefs and convictions about higher education are. I think the Governor and the Legislature are to be commended for their interest in this enterprise because, as has been suggested this morning, this is a time when we are facing serious challenges about what we are doing, how much should be invested in us, and what the future holds.

No one in this room would deny the importance of education. If we stop and think about why that is, we could probably have some very rich conversation which would tell us much about the responsibilities of education for the future. Take a minute to think about the history of public education in the United States and higher education in particular. When we think about the colonial times in which fairly affluent white males were able to live in small residential settings for the purpose of studying theology, we realize we have come a long way. Higher education has expanded in accordance with democratizing Jeffersonian ideas. The establishment of land grant institutions acknowledged that curriculum should be broad, feed back to the people of the state, and be accessible to all who have the ability to partake in it. The expansion of higher education demonstrates the belief in the responsibility of public education.

The theme of access, that theme of broadening content, that theme of applied knowledge runs throughout what we have done. It is fairly easy to stop and define, at least in broad terms, what today's responsibilities about education are before we begin to think about tomorrow. We all believe that education is the institution in our society that has been given the responsibility for transmitting whatever knowledge exists at a given time. It is particularly beneficial because we have an institution that can itself be studied so we can discover if we are doing it well, if we can do it better, and if we are applying our resources well. We believe that education is a system which should not only transmit that knowledge but also should actively help create it.

If we consider the time span from when children start in school and are asked to think about how the world is organized, how

it could be changed, how it could be different through their experience in great research universities of the country in which graduate students stand side by side with professors and make discoveries which change the course of our lives and the course of civilization, we come to believe in the responsibility to create knowledge. It is interesting in this connection to note that sixty percent of the basic research done in this country last year was done in colleges and universities and that three fourths of that basic research was funded by the federal government. We also find that we have come to believe that the university and public education in particular are places which should help us adapt to the changing conditions that are around us.

We talk a lot about the changing world and I can tell you that in my two years away from Oklahoma I can see a lot of changes. This is certainly a state in which you can see that kind of change occurring. Universities are places that help us adapt to the pressures, challenges, and opportunities that are around us. At the same time they are institutions that allow us to draw back and be somewhat abstract, objective, and intellectual about those very changes which universities are helping to create. Universities, in a non-biased but systematic way, help us reflect on what changes we are producing and what kind of impact they are having. So we are not only responsible for building bigger and better computers, but we are responsible for asking the question: "What effects are those computers having on our lives. What do they mean to the concept of privacy? What does it mean about how communication will occur in the future? Are we, in fact, building the right things for the future in our classrooms, in view of the changes in technology which will undoubtedly ensue as the computer becomes evermore refined?"

Perhaps that is not the most exciting responsibility of public education, but it is certainly one that we want to protect. We can all agree upon the following: through education, we are investing in human capital, we are transmitting knowledge, we are creating knowledge, we are helping society adapt itself to change and in positive ways. Why, then, are we at a point when those statements are under challenge? Why are we here having to talk about how good we are and how positive we feel?

As I reflect on it, I think the primary reason has to do with resources. We are at a point when the resources which have supported educational activities are changing in nature, and priorities are shifting. When we find that resources begin to disappear or change in nature, or when significant segments of society are unhappy with a particular enterprise, then we stop to examine once more what our responsibilities are and ask if we can do any better at what we are supposed to be doing.

Let us look for a minute at the resource picture. We have human resources, which we sometimes neglect. We focus so much on fiscal resources that we fail to realize how important those human resources are. We have trained faculty which is our work force. Their characteristics and their attitudes are tremendously important to the success of the enterprise in which we are engaged. We hear

about aging faculty, about high proportions of tenure, about faculty who believe themselves involved in a less prestigious occupation, about faculty whose wages have failed to keep up with the Consumer Price Index. We begin to shake our heads and ask ourselves how can we be any good when the most important and vital part of what we are, our faculty, is beginning to be portrayed in these bleak terms. I might add that I don't agree with all of these bleak terms, but those are some of the things that we hear. Turn to the question of staff. Support staff in colleges and universities in particular have been neglected populations, except in those rare instances where they are unionizing. A group of people who constitute a very large proportion of workers on any campus has been largely ignored. They have had little systematic training. We tend to catch them as catch can. They are given poorer salaries than even the faculty and they have high turnover rates. In Missouri, a state about which I know more now, our staff is paid at 25% below the market rates, and we wonder at times how we are able to keep them. But in fact, our statistics show that we are not able to keep some of the lower ranking staff because we have a turnover rate among them of 38%. Talk about high costs! That is a high cost which has been largely ignored because we fail to pay attention to a significant group of workers which constitute a significant resource to us in the education enterprise. Students, too, constitute a resource. We are more mindful of that and we are more concerned about attracting students and providing access to the most able but we still need more efforts in that regard.

Turn for a minute to the question of capital resources. I do not know what the picture is here in Oklahoma. I am not as familiar with it as I was, but I know that there must be some of the same problems that still exist in other states. Some facilities have been overbuilt, some underbuilt. There is a problem with distribution of space. The corporate world suggests to us that we should be putting 1% of our budget annually back into capital facilities. In Missouri, at the University of Missouri, Columbia, we have put in about that much over the entire last five year period. I am happy to report that I think our legislature is becoming more responsive and more aware of that need. It is our job to help make those needs known and I am not sure we have done a good enough job. Capital facilities are important resources which need attention and about which we are beginning to hear weak things.

Look at the fiscal resources on which we concentrate so much effort. We talk about federal sources, state sources, local support in some instances, and fees, and we see a shifting funding mix which goes far beyond the purposes of this discussion today. We are all concerned about shifting federal priorities which will be reflected in student aid and various kinds of grants. We all see an increasing responsibility on the part of the states, in which we are housed, to come in and pick up some of the financial burden. And this is at a time when costs of higher education, even though they have not kept up with the Consumer Price Index, have more than doubled since 1972. I read last week in the Wall Street Journal, and I suspect many of

you have read some of these same figures, that this year the average cost of fees of public institutions of higher learning in this country will be over \$3,800.00 and private over \$6,400.00. Total cost involved in the most expensive institution reported is over \$12,000.00 annually. We cannot expect students to bear a great deal more of the burden than they presently are in higher education. If that is the case, from where will the resources come? It is not surprising that state officials and legislators are beginning to ask of higher education: "Do you really need all that money? What are you doing anyway? Can't we simply become more productive? Can't we cut down some of these costs and be more efficient?" We are beginning to feel the pressure as administrators respond.

For just a few minutes I would like to talk about the concept of productivity in higher education, because I think it is an important one, one that we are going to hear more about, and one about which there is an enormous amount of misunderstanding. Let us examine the corporate model. Productivity is, according to the corporate model, the ratio of outputs to inputs. When we apply this concept to higher education or to education in general, we start talking about what are outputs and inputs as they describe our productivity. We have chosen students to serve as measures of output. When I was on the board, I became very familiar with some of those early models, in particular those which focus almost entirely on quantitative data. We talked about number of students graduated before we got a little more sophisticated. Or we talked about the cost of instruction. On the input side, we talked about faculty and dollars. The ratios we could come up with very easily were quantitative ones which suggested that the more students we served, the more students we graduated, the fewer dollars we put in the more productive we were. This is just the opposite of what any good faculty member will tell you represents quality. So we have a measure of productivity, in many instances by which we have been defending ourselves which is the very opposite of what we say we should be about in quality institutions. Most of us would argue that more contact with faculty (which means smaller classes), more dollars spent in the form of better equipped labs, and teaching assistants are useful to produce the quality that we are talking about. Now what is the answer to this? Does it mean that as educators we stand off defensibly and say, "Gee, don't talk to us about productivity because that's the opposite of quality and all we are interested in is quality." We do not try to defend what we are saying or positively assert what we mean by quality. We cannot say no, we are not interested in productivity. I think we have a very important and, perhaps, a very tough job ahead of us. That task is to help us realize, first of all, and then help those who support us realize that it is an oversimplification to talk about productivity as we have in the past. We cannot say that the question is beyond analysis; we have to come up with some alternatives.

What are those alternatives? Well, in my opinion, it means we have to get very specific as to goals to be accomplished in any given institution, and to say exactly what it is we are about, how

we intend to accomplish our goals and how we can be evaluated. Instead of just asking for more dollars to train undergraduates, we need to be far more knowledgeable and able to defend our choices about what kinds of undergraduates, what fields to offer, how many, and what forms of programs. If our goal is to increase affirmative action programs and to increase the participation of minorities, our past tendency has been simply to ask for more dollars to put into the programs rather than saying that we will have particular programs which we are willing to test out and make sure that they work or modify them if they don't work and then put those dollars into those programs. I think we have to demonstrate responsibility for research. Instead of just asking for more dollars for research, we have the increasingly important job of demonstrating the value of the research. States who support institutions of higher learning must be able to see the potential value of basic as well as applied research.

Discussions with department chairs on our campus bring about an awareness that they have learned a very important strategy: to acquire dollars, faculty, offices and space, and to hold on to them at all costs. If as an administrator you try to alter that strategy you are in trouble. The problem is that we are not focussing on the right questions. I suspect, at least I sincerely hope, that most of those dollars are being translated into some very good things. When we have more faculty we are able to serve more students and serve them well. The point is we have not set up systems which focus on the right questions. We have to do that before people on the outside come in and want to tell us and define for us the meaning of productivity.

That leads me to the last major point. Who should begin to make these decisions about what constitutes appropriate goals for given institutions, or for an entire state? Who should be the decision makers and what kinds of decisions should they make? Personally, I am a great believer in the state as an appropriate unit in which these analyses can be made. I think we can't look at it institution by institution because we will not find out how many programs are being duplicated too close to one another. We will not find out if we have efficient kinds of units. We have to look across states and I think it is very appropriate for the state to take certain kinds of polls and say, "We believe in and support research, but we can only do it in certain institutions," or "We will do it to this extent in certain institutions". "We believe that we have to provide health services for the people of the state but we also have some data that suggests we may be becoming oversupplied." At least let discussion occur and at the state level. That seems an appropriate unit of analysis.

What has happened in many instances is that those at the highest level of authority (whether it is the state legislature, coordinating board, some board official, or occasionally even the federal government) have rushed in to tell us how we are doing and how we should be performing. We all resent that. How many times have we all read or maybe written articles or have participated in sessions in which

we have said get the "feds" away from us. They are telling us how to do things. They are telling us in detail about safety requirements. They are telling us in great detail how to handle our veterans. They are telling us how to run our intercollegiate athletic programs. Now, why are they involved in the nitty-gritty of what goes on in institutions? Don't they trust us? Well, maybe they don't and maybe they should. Perhaps one reason they do not is because we have not moved far enough, fast enough, to identify our collective goals and interests. We are not interested simply in hanging on to dollars and to territory, but in achieving our goals as measures of our productivity and providing guidelines to establish our own systems to move toward our goals. I can tell you that I personalize this because, as a chancellor, I often ask myself who should be making the decisions about what happens in departments. And I can assure you that some days it is so tempting for me to pick up the phone and tell a department chair why don't you do such and such because that is what you need to be doing. I have to back off because that is not the way I would want somebody to help me run our institution. What I have is a responsibility to help set up a situation in which that department chair and I can negotiate appropriate goals for that department and then set out a strategy to help get us there. If that department chair is interested in building an international reputation for scholars and I see that department as serving undergraduate students at the freshman level, we are never going to agree on whether there is any success or whether appropriate resources are being given. We have to agree on the goals at the outset and we have to agree on what is going to constitute progress once we get there or we will never get this institution clicking.

I think a similar thing has happened at the state level. So, broadly speaking, you might fairly ask me what are appropriate decisions at the state level? What is the first rule? What can be done? I would like to suggest these: first, it is important that the state set up a mechanism so institutional goals, and program goals can be negotiated - and I mean negotiated. Let me use learning to play the piano as an example of negotiation. When I was a child taking piano lessons there was no negotiation involved. I had to learn to play the piano. That was the goal and we did not have to talk much about it. Presumably, I was supposed to learn to play well. I remember having an instructor who I only later learned to resent. I resented her, but I did not understand why I resented her until later when I realized it was because we tediously went through note after note and rhythm after rhythm and we began to string these little bits and pieces together and I was never told what the whole thing was supposed to sound like. It would have been extremely helpful at the beginning if she had sat down and performed the piece for me, told me that this is what the piece of music is saying and that it wasn't too important how high you raised your fourth finger as long as the music communicates how you feel about it to those listening. That would have been very helpful. Sometimes I think in education we are at the level of telling people they should string this note together and raise fingers thusly to do this and this rather than saying this is what the whole thing

should be about, let us sit down and reason together and negotiate what that whole thing should be about. Secondly, I think there needs to be a commitment to hire the most creative and responsible academic leaders and managers that one can find and then let them go. Stop telling them how to do their jobs, but fire them if they don't do it. Make sure you understand what they are supposed to be doing and then turn them loose. Only with that incentive will we get some of the creativity that will help make education as responsive as it has been in earlier times.

We need to be committed to quality and we need to hold it high. Let us not settle for productivity as measured by quantity. Let us keep talking about what quality is, even if we have a difficult time trying to define it; remain committed to quality, but not committed to a failure to define it. Let us keep working on that. I also think the state can be useful in helping involve other people, such as industry, who have not traditionally been interested in education. There can be some very useful, creative ways in which industry can become involved in the state as a tremendous unit to help education.

The future is tomorrow. Someone has said the future is today. We are building right now what our future is going to be tomorrow. Nobody knows quite what shape or form it is going to take, but unless we can work to preserve the flexibility, adaptability, and quality of the system which we have evolved and in which we have come to believe, we will not be prepared to meet that future. This country has unique demands on it today. None of us knows how that will be solved, but we are in the business of creating the conditions in which other people will solve these problems. So with judicious guidance, the hiring of intelligent people and a continued commitment to investing in human capital, at whatever level, we can reason that to be, we will indeed meet tomorrow's responsibilities and balance today's budget.

Transcriber: Juanita Kidd

Editor: Diane Brown

Panel: Ad Valorem Taxes and Schools

Senator Rodger A. Randle, Moderator

No topic is as full of change and controversy in Oklahoma as ad valorem taxes. It will continue to be since the ad valorem system supports schools. The topic is one of immediacy and importance.

Remarks by Panel Members

Mr. James Walker, Chairman, Oklahoma Tax Commission

I want to present an overview of the current ad valorem tax system in Oklahoma and its status. Lewis Bohr, Director of the Ad Valorem Division, has some handouts available after this session. They might be of interest.

Events of nine years ago have bearing on the present situation. In 1972 a state question was passed amending Article 10 Section 8 of the State Constitution. It redefined fair cash value of property and real estate. Before that, assessment was determined on the market value of the property. Now it is defined on the highest and best use or class in the calendar year before sale. The transfer of property does not necessitate reevaluation. If the use remains the same there's no reason to adjust the value of the property.

Statutes indicate that the Legislature shall be empowered to enact certain classifications of property. Title 68 Sections 24-27 has never been amended to define classification. To assess property, it has to be classified. That duty fell to the Tax Commission which created three basic classifications: residential, agricultural, and industrial/commercial. This was used first in 1976. It is now sanctioned by the State Board of Equalization.

Governor Boren requested use value guidelines and assessing techniques for agricultural property be established. The Commission in October, 1976 had prepared a ratio study on use value in which the use value equalled the market value.

In attempting to assess agricultural property, many factors come into play. To disregard the influence of productivity, an index was developed for soil use types. Assessors were given this information and were to come up with use value for farming purposes. Nearly all counties have completed the job.

The assessor takes a grid map, adds up types of soils, tallies the value of soil production, chemical content, and rainfall, and ultimately arrives at the value of the soils. The value is multiplied by the assessed value used by the county and the product is multiplied by the millage rate to arrive at the tax liability.

In 1975, as a result of the Poulos suit, the State Board of Equalization established a 12%, plus or minus 3%, composite ratio. In 1977 the Board ordered some counties to come up to the 12% ratio. Some assessors failed to reach even the 9% allowable. Inflation was

a contributing factor. Land is appreciating faster than county assessors can keep up with the inflation. They found inflation playing an important role, arbitrarily holding back some counties in trying to reach the state ratio. By 1980 forty counties required only small increases to bring them into compliance.

An important event occurred in March, 1980 when the State Supreme Court, ruling in the Cantrell case, determined assessors were to use only one assessment rate in the county. Previously agricultural land was assessed at the lowest rate, industrial at the highest. Senate Concurrent Resolution 54 directed that the use value used by the Tax Commission and assessors should be limited to use. No speculative value was to be considered for fear of wide-spread land speculation.

The Tax Commission developed a technical guide and definition for actual use value. It used the same guidelines as in the ratio studies. The outcome was a further look at agricultural lands to look at speculation creating an excess market value for agricultural land. The Commission was to determine the amount of speculation, recalculate it, revise it and make recommendations by June, 1980. The Commission was unable to meet the deadline and sought outside help to complete the task.

Speculation assumes risk. People expect to profit. Residential and agricultural land has been increasing in value. The increase is vitally important to the seller. Speculation builds up property worth in comparing market value and the actual worth. The Commission tried to develop a ratio for use value, less the speculative value. It recommended agricultural property be reduced 40% from its present value. Residential property (in the metro area) should be reduced 5% and the outlying areas reduced 10% were also recommendations.

The 1981 Tax Commission ratio study showed the State Board of Equalization where the counties were in light of the Cantrell decision. There is still considerable variance regarding assessment. Many hadn't had time to make adjustments to use the single rate. The Board was asked to look at the 12% rate in light of the inflation. It may mean an adjustment in that rate. There have been large increases in land values since 1976. Many people attended the Board's hearing. A subcommittee was to redefine the use value. The Board rejected the Tax Commission ratio study and instead accepted the reports by the assessors. The decision was to give the assessors another year to get on line.

Lewis Bohr will have available the ranking of school districts by assessed valuation. The range is from \$293.00 to \$1,052.00 per student. The ad valorem tax is a stable income source of revenue. Between 1975 and 1980 the net valuation grew from \$4.6 billion to \$6.7 billion. Two thirds goes to schools. In 1980 there was \$530 million available and \$350 million went to schools.

Several counties are running short on funds. Better equalization within counties is in order. All counties are trying to apply use value. Some aren't doing all that they could. We have a long way to go. The Tax Commission is shying away from giving a simple formula.

Assessors must give actual value within the parameters of other factors. Decisions aren't always popular. Attention must be given to adequate staffing. All actions of assessors must be taken in relationship to current law.

Ms. Rosa Mae Sublett, President, County Tax Assessors Association

I want to speak more on the local level. Assessors are vitally interested in education. We are as interested in county government as you could be. We favor strong local county government. I feel the news media slants things to pit people against each other and I don't like it. It is not fair. We should be working for common goals. We should be trying to upgrade our offices. Mr. Walker says they are giving us another year; they haven't given us the use values. We are trying to do the job.

Since I took office in 1975 there have been 35 new assessors across the State. Some of us inherited situations hard to overcome. Inflation hit us hard during this time. Previous assessors were getting tired of the battle. We want to do a good job. We were elected to do a good job. Most of us are trying to do a good job. It is a time consuming job to re-evaluate property. Much bookkeeping and administrative work is involved. By the time a property gets on the records inflation has taken effect.

The ad valorem tax base for schools has been overstated. The county gets one dollar for every five the schools receive. They get 66% of the county ad valorem tax base. My hometown gets 17%. Our salaries depend on the tax base. There's a double motive here to get things on the rolls! I looked at tax ratio information. Forty-eight percent of the money went to schools but they didn't get much ADA support. The county valuation isn't there. There's little agricultural land and little personal property. Other schools get federal money that Pryor doesn't get. Look at other schools out of the county. Mayes has some industry. Other districts have other resources. Ft. Gibson, where my grandchildren are, is blessed with an OG&E plant. They don't put one in every county. The ad valorem tax is not the whole problem in funding. Equalization within counties is an impossibility. For example: a \$50,000.00 house assessed two years ago at a 10% base equalled a \$5,000.00 assessed rate. Today a similar house would cost \$55,000.00 and be assessed at \$5,500.00. One house will have cheaper taxes unless the assessor raised taxes. The problem is a continuous thing. We like to stress the positive. We are all facing the same thing.

Dr. Clarence Oliver, Superintendent, Broken Arrow Public Schools

School districts live and die by the ad valorem tax rate. It is easy to understand why chief executive officers (CEOs) are concerned about them. Some concerns I'd like to share with you in hoping for legislative action are the following.

First, in regard to the evaluation/assessment ratio as it applies

to property, assessors don't have properly trained people to designate the true value of property. They may accept the value given by an industry/business' CEO. Business/industry should expect to pay an equitable fair tax rate. Chamber of Commerce reports on the value of businesses, when compared to the assessed ad valorem rate of property, may be inconsistent. Business/industry may not want to carry their tax burden.

Second, a new federal law in the internal revenue code may have an impact on tax rates. It encourages lease transactions to avoid tax liabilities that could mean less money for Oklahoma. In Oklahoma a title that is held by a bank is tax exempt. This is being encouraged. It could be detrimental.

Third, research about change in the median price of houses and the assessment of them is not keeping pace. Some change is needed to keep up. If they (assessors) can't keep up, we may need Poulos' special master. If equality isn't possible, we may need a new system.

Mr. Murl Venard, Director of Finance, State Department of Education

My assignment is to give the State Department's position on ad valorem. Attention should be called to inequities especially in capital outlay. This may be the area of greatest disparity. It will be a critical topic next session and in others. The ability of school districts varies immensely. Another concern is in adjusting the amount of ad valorem tax in figuring ADA support. Counties have to be at least at the 9% rate to guarantee money to districts.

Recorder: Diane Brown

Panel: Educating the Non-Traditional Student

Ms. Barbara Ware, Assistant Principal, Ponca City High School, Moderator

Remarks by Panel Members

Ms. Debbie Fillmore, Supervisor, Alternative Education Programs, Oklahoma City Public Schools

Alternative education includes any educational program different from the traditional classroom setting. It may be vocational training or classes for dropouts or suspended students. Some alternative education programs are provided by school systems; some are provided by agencies working with a school system.

The Oklahoma City Alternative Education Program is sponsored by the Metro Alliance for Safer Cities. It provides academic work and counseling. Its objectives are to avoid student dropout and to limit the referrals to the juvenile justice system.

Characteristics of alternative education systems include individualized instruction when possible, a low student-teacher ratio, communication with other agencies, patient-staff, a reward system based on easily obtainable goals, and preparation for the world of work.

The student who is frustrated in competition with others and has a sense of failure or who is not motivated by the traditional system is a candidate for an alternative school. The critical period for dropouts is 9th grade. Providing an individualized program for such students allows them to pursue a program for seventy hours or ninety hours or the number of hours needed for completion.

Dr. Richard Poole, Vice President for University Relations and Development, Oklahoma State University

The non-traditional student is found in any age group and in any setting. Higher education, vocational-technical schools and the public schools need to work together to serve citizens.

Dynamic societies tend eventually to stagnate and decline. However, a dynamic society can achieve renewal if it is willing to deal with chance, try a different approach and risk failure. Change is harder for us as we get older, but if educational agencies are slow to change, learners will find other agencies to meet their needs.

Eighty percent of American adults are involved in learning. They usually prefer to pace themselves. Many prefer to study at home. They frequently are committed students. Cognitive abilities remain with us as long as we are healthy.

Dr. Sunshine Atkins, Director, Center for the Displaced Homemaker, Moore-Norman Area Vocational-Technical School

Displaced homemakers are sometimes described as the "New Poor." They usually enter the work force because of the disability or death

of a spouse.

The Legislature provided a displaced homemaker program in 1978. In the same year, Moore-Norman established its program. It is funded through the Vocational-Technical Department at no charge to the participant.

Career and personal counseling are offered with goals of improving self-esteem, improved decision-making ability, legal assistance, goal setting, assistance with job information and search, administering aptitude and interest tests, and acquiring a skill. Many do not qualify for other programs.

The six to twelve million displaced homemakers in the United States are accustomed to staying home with unstructured time. Their average age is between thirty and forty. Without skills they are likely to earn only a minimum wage. Short-term training helps many to gain employment at higher pay.

Recorder: Mary Cherry

Panel: Government-Mandated Curriculum

Dr. William Hodges, Superintendent, Stillwater Public Schools,
Moderator

Remarks by Panel Members

Mr. Joseph Scherer, Associate Executive Director, American Association
of School Administrators, Office of Governmental Relations

I speak to the issue of government mandates and will detail a recent study funded by NIE which profiled state government involvement in education in each of the fifty states. Surprisingly, Oklahoma falls in second place with regard to state government involvement in education. Hawaii is number one with regard to high state control in education. Also, on the issue of setting minimal competencies by states, thirty-three states to date have set some type of minimal competencies for their public schools. It is my theory that because of the many problems associated with minimal competencies, they are not a workable solution. I call for greater citizen initiative and involvement and feel that the solutions to our education problems are to be found at the state and local levels rather than at the federal level of government.

Mr. Tommy Fulton, Deputy Director, Oklahoma Education Association

I represent the viewpoints of O.E.A. members on mandated curriculum. I challenge mandates as taking away from local control, combining education policy-making with politics, reducing teacher autonomy and professionalism and emphasizing the welfare of large groups rather than the welfare of individual children. I also challenge mandates as adding to teachers' already limited time needed for the basics. I agree that the question of who makes curriculum decisions is a critical issue and believe that the O.E.A. does not support state mandates. I do not believe the mandates are in the best interests of school children in Oklahoma.

Mrs. Karen Leveridge, President, Oklahoma Congress of Parents and Teachers

I want to address the prospective parent regarding mandates. I emphasize that parents must be consulted about curriculum decisions and that, in return, parents must be willing to study, read and become knowledgeable about today's schools, today's needs and how these are combined in a relevant curriculum. Parent groups have worked both for and against state mandates here in Oklahoma. The support, either way, of the PTA, is a response to a particular situation, and specific need, spoken to by a proposed mandate. However, parent groups, choosing to work for mandates, should also work as well toward the financing of such mandates by the State.

Dr. Don Edwards, Superintendent, Millwood Public Schools

I represent public schools from an administrator's point of view, and will outline the pros and cons associated with the theory of mandates. On the con side, public schools have been forced to become the change agent for all society and, as a result, public schools have had to take on many tasks far removed from education. Also on the negative side, no financial support has been combined with the mandates; therefore, those mandates have cut into an already tight budget. Government mandates appear to make the schools scapegoats for the failures in homes and in government policies. On the pro side, many government mandated programs have come about because of the championing of the underdog, a principle upon which our country was formed. I admit it was possible to change the environment and hence society through mandating changes in our schools, that schools were often reluctant to take on change and that government mandates helped schools become more responsive to the rights and needs of minorities. To value any law, one must understand the intent of that law. Perhaps, occasional mandates are necessary to protect the interests of special groups or individuals. In conclusion, schools cannot be all things to all people, neither can they provide all solutions to individual needs.

Recorder: Kay York

General Session - Debate - Tuition Tax Credits/Voucher System

Mr. Tony Clark, Public Affairs Director for News, KWTN Television,
Moderator

Opposing Viewpoint: Mr. Nat LaCour, Vice President, American
Federation of Teachers, President, United Teachers of New Orleans

Supporting Viewpoint: Mr. Chester E. Finn, Jr., Director,
Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University,
Past Legislative Director for the Office of U.S. Senator Daniel
Patrick Moynihan

Summary of Remarks by Speakers

Mr. Nat LaCour

The pros and cons of voucher systems have been debated in several states. Through this system a certificate (voucher) would be issued to parents for each school child. The voucher would be worth a set amount of money. It could be used as tuition at any public school or applied toward tuition at any nonpublic school. If the cost of tuition at a nonpublic school should exceed the face value of the voucher, parents would be responsible for making up the difference. The use of vouchers is one method of directing public funds into nonpublic schools.

Tuition tax credits is another method. The present administration (Washington, D.C.) is campaigning for passage of legislation that would give parents of children in nonpublic schools an opportunity to recover part of their tuition payments by crediting their tax liability. The bill now being considered by Congress, Tuition Tax Relief Act of 1981, S 550, co-sponsored by Senators Packwood (R-OR) and Moynihan (D-NY), would allow a tax credit of up to \$500.00.

Much of the opposition to tuition tax credits and voucher systems has been based on the belief that they violate the constitutional separation of church and state. The American Federation of Teachers agrees with that objection and opposes them for additional reasons.

First, a mass exodus of children from middle class families would occur from public schools, substantially reducing support for public schools. This would result in a loss of revenue. A caste system would develop with the rise in the percentage of low income children remaining in public schools.

Second, education policy would change at the federal level. There would be less money available for the education of poor children, handicapped children and non-English speaking children as well as for those classified as "hard to educate".

Third, tuition tax credits return tax dollars to those who need them the least. It would open the door for additional funds being allocated to nonpublic education through a push from people with money

and influence.

Fourth, children in nonpublic schools would be receiving more in federal funds than those in public schools. This would be coming at a time when federal funds to public education are being cut.

The AFT believes that citizens should have a choice between public and nonpublic schools, but it opposes public assistance to nonpublic education.

Mr. Chester Finn

The central question is whether or not government should aid private schools. If the answer is that it should, there are several methods that can be used.

The voucher system should not be a part of a tuition tax credit discussion. They are two separate and very different methods. A voucher system could not be considered by the federal government, because it only controls 10% of the funds provided to education. Such a system would eliminate both public and private schools as we know them and replace them with a different kind of system. Tuition tax credits, on the other hand, would leave both types of institutions intact.

Little is known about many private schools because they only share information as they see fit. It is known that they are a diverse group. Traditionally private schools have been thought of as being Catholic institutions. This is no longer a valid assumption. There are many types of private and parochial schools and their density varies widely across the country.

It is true that government financial aid to private schools could be accompanied by some government controls. Some of these schools are willing to accept controls along with the aid. Those that do not want the controls do not have to participate.

There are strings attached to the tuition tax credit legislation to protect against its misuse.

First, participating schools must exist in accordance with state laws which affect such schools.

Second, they must be nonprofit.

Third, they must not discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin.

Fourth, schools would not be required to admit a student just because he/she would receive a tuition tax credit.

I favor limited aid to private and parochial schools. Other private institutions such as private colleges and universities as well as private hospitals are already receiving some form of government assistance. Low income families would have the same kinds of opportunities as middle and upper income families. Giving aid to poor people is defensible public policy.

Questions Posed by the Media Panel for the Speakers

Mr. Jack Edens, KLTE Radio

By admitting that tuition tax credits might cause flight from

public schools, aren't you saying that public schools are not doing the job?

Mr. Nat LaCour

Problems do exist in public schools. However, nonpublic schools can be selective. They do not have to accept all children. Revenues should be concentrated on those areas in public schools where improvement is indicated.

Mr. Chester Finn

If public schools are not attractive, individuals can leave. Public schools should concentrate on becoming more attractive.

Mr. Gan Matthews, KOCO Television

In New York a tuition tax credit plan was declared unconstitutional. Hasn't that issue been decided?

Mr. Chester Finn

It has not been decided at the federal level. Other types of private institutions are receiving federal assistance without any problems. The establishment clause has not been interpreted as it was intended since 1947.

Mr. Nat LaCour

The U.S. Attorney General has ruled that tuition tax credits are unconstitutional.

Mr. Chester Finn

That Attorney General served under Carter who received a great deal of support from education associations.

Ms. Pam Infield, Tulsa Tribune

Would \$500.00 be enough to help poor people?

Mr. Chester Finn

A larger amount would be better, but \$500.00 is considerable. Some schools have very low tuition.

Mr. Nat LaCour

Tuition in nonpublic schools will rise once tuition tax credits are made available. Proponents of tuition tax credits are using the \$500.00 to get their "foot in the door". More such legislation would follow from the federal level and possibly from the states.

Mr. Jack Edens, KLTE Radio

Isn't this proposal directed primarily at middle class families?

Mr. Nat LaCour

Yes, and it would result in a loss of political support for public schools.

Mr. Jack Edens, KLTE Radio

Why should the AFT be concerned about this issue?

Mr. Nat LaCour

This proposal will cause a shift of emphasis in education. Now we have a good class mixture in education and have succeeded in providing an education across all class lines. The exodus of the middle class will be detrimental to those who are left behind.

Mr. Gan Matthews, KOCO Television

Are you concerned about the intrusion of the federal government into private schools?

Mr. Chester Finn

Yes, but those schools that don't want the regulations don't have to participate.

A Question from the Audience

Will private schools have to submit to all the regulations that affect public schools?

Mr. Chester Finn

We don't require all private institutions now receiving aid to operate under all government regulations.

Mr. Nat LaCour

Private schools do not have to open to low quality students. The quality of education received depends to a large extent on the quality of students participating.

Mr. Chester Finn

I do not believe that open doors keep a school from being the best. Constraints need to be removed.

Ms. Pam Infield, Tulsa Tribune

Isn't competition healthy?

Mr. Nat LaCour

Public schools must accept all students while nonpublic schools can be selective. Comparisons between the two are not fair.

A Question from the Audience

Why not help old parochial schools in the poor areas of the inner city?

Mr. Nat LaCour

There is no difference in academic performance between inner city parochial schools and public schools.

Recorder: Diane Blank

General Session - The Changing Federal Role in Education

Dr. Leslie Fisher, State Superintendent for Public Instruction, Moderator

Remarks by Panel Members

Mr. Terry Herndon, Executive Director, National Education Association

There's much being said these days about the federal role in education and in many of those discussions it oft seems like a roomfull of hennypennies. Everybody's running about talking about the sky falling. Certainly there's plenty of cause for pessimism and cynicism; because if I were to describe the intentions of the people presently in Washington, D.C., the people presently leading our government, I perceive that their policy could be simply stated as one of dis-establishment, diminution, decentralization, deemphasis, and disassembly. Now I suspect that on that list of five many of you could find at least one that you thought was attractive. Some of you might find more than one attractive, but as is the case with most crowds of educators these days, I suspect that you also find much on that list that is unappealing.

This administration has fairly enthusiastically embraced an agenda for a federal role in education that was defined by the Heritage Foundation a long time before this administration assumed office. The Heritage Foundation proposed that the federal role in education be eliminated. It proposed that the Department of Education be eliminated. It proposed that the federal government develop a system of monetary support for private schools. It proposed a diminished role for whatever is the federal office in education in the area of civil rights and in the enforcement of equal opportunity.

Now the Heritage Foundation thinkers were fairly insightful. They realized that the effort to implement that agenda would be rather controversial, at least insofar as Congressional politics were concerned. So they went on to recommend steps for implementation, and a proposal was made that rather than addressing the question of the Department of Education early on, and rather than addressing the recision of all the Congressional authorizations in terms of federal aid to education, that the administration begin with a program of block granting coupled with budget cuts and in the process reduce the significance of the programs so that when they got around to dealing with Congressional authorizations the programs would have been reduced to insignificance, and they would have not had to cash a lot of chips over the recision of significant programs. Now any who know the Washington scene, or have monitored the Washington scene over the past decade, would have suggested that not only were the objectives probably impossible, but the strategy was absurd. And that's the remarkable thing about Washington, D.C. these days. Impossible objectives are being achieved, and absurd strategies are being successful. This administration through extraordinary

demonstrations of leadership skill and extraordinary comprehension of the ins and outs of the workings of the federal government are well down the road toward the total disassembling of the historical role in education played by the federal government; significantly down the road to the Heritage Foundation strategy for the elimination of federal aid to education; and, of course, it is yet to be seen precisely what they will do in the near future in regard to the Department of Education and aid for private education. But they certainly are lending their voices and whatever moral persuasion they have to cultivating a political environment in which it will be possible to dismantle the Department of Education and to bring to pass a substantial measure of federal support for private education.

Now it may seem somewhat absurd for me, then, to stand here and to say to you that I truly believe that ten years from now the role of the federal government in elementary and secondary education, and for that matter higher education which precipitates less controversy out in the hustings, will be substantially what it is at this point in time . . . meaning what it has been for the last several years. It is my own personal belief based upon untold thousands of miles of travel throughout the United States that the sitting President of the United States is seriously miscalculating the public mood insofar as public education is concerned. Now I will not harangue that point, but I will simply observe that in spite of economic adversity, in spite of demographic adversity, in spite of an economic environment that makes taxes exceedingly unpopular, all available public opinion polling still shows that the vast majority of the American people feel good about their public schools. A study of the record will show that over the past decade there has been a 25% increase in the resources made available for the public schools when adjusted for inflation, and that is in spite of some decline in the student population. The data will show that in spite of all the reasons given in the media for the mass migration of children out of the public schools into private schools, the simple fact is that in 1980 the public schools enrolled a larger portion of the 5-17 year old cohort than ever in the history of the United States of America. There are more reasons offered for the abandonment of the public schools than there are people abandoning the public schools. The public schools are here to stay - the public will persist in its demand for quality in those schools, and those of us who share some of the responsibility for the failings had best respond to that public demand and that will include members of Congress and the President of the United States because the people are looking for solutions to the problems of the schools, not exploitation to the end of their disassemblage, so that we might put in their place a network of private schools.

Nevertheless, these are very difficult times. Now I for one do not accept an indeterminate future. I believe that there will be many politics played out the next two years, indeed the next four years and following that every year that this republic has left as its future. I believe that the public schools, as they always have in the past, will prevail as hope over contemporary

reality - the environment has always looked bad - but there have always been true believers, and when the line was written the people demanded that the politicians respond to the needs of the schools.

Now having said that, I have to acknowledge that in the short term future it is very probable that the Reagan administration's agenda will prevail, and we ought to anticipate that there will be a diminution of the federal role in education. But more significantly there will be a reduction in the dollars made available by the federal government for education. That will ultimately be reversed as well in my opinion. The first rule of intergovernmental relations in education is maximize the flow of external dollars while minimizing the flow of external controls. The federal government did not ever volunteer to get into education. There were unmet needs, and there were problems that state and local authorities either could not or chose not to resolve, and as the local authorities found themselves incapable or unwilling to do so the politics shifted to the state and/or national programs. Well, at the present time the states are encumbered in forty different places by spending lids or tax lids. That's a significant limitation on their ability to solve problems. Demographic shifts are occurring in the country, and they have produced a result such that only 20% of the eligible voters in the United States today have children in the public schools, and that has made it exceedingly difficult to pass local millage referenda, local bond issues, or any other form of ad valorem taxes that require the assent of the majority of the electorate. Daniel Yankolovich and others will show you poll after poll which suggest that even parents of children in the United States reject the historical notion that they ought to sacrifice heavily for their children. So there are major changes occurring in the willingness of the populace to impose ad valorem taxes on themselves.

Now we have the federal budget cuts, and on top of that an effect that has not yet been experienced or even acknowledged by most of the media and that is that the federal tax cut because of the interaction of state tax laws will lead to billions of dollars in reduction of state revenues from their own tax systems. In as much as state after state has education as the largest single category of discretionary spending, dramatic reductions in state revenue usually results in state aid to education. So the public schools are facing a quadruple fiscal whammy that is going to be experienced over the next half decade. There will be a lot pain. There will be a lot of misery. There will be a need for a great deal of forbearance and patience by the people who labor in those schools. But ultimately that quadruple whammy is going to produce a demand for resources that has not existed in the schools for many decades, and there will be a demand for a response. The principal demand as I see it will be for a federal response with the most productive, the most elastic, and the most equitable tax package available to the American people; and that will lead to magnification of the federal role unless the state and local governments are far more responsive than they've been heretofore.

Mrs. A.T. Leveridge, National President, P.T.A.

Before I begin my prepared text, I would say to you that I have come to the discovery that without a well-qualified teacher in the classroom, and unless learning is taking place, we do not have education.

I am a member of the Texas State Board of Education, and I have experienced the headaches, the heartburn, and the frustrations over federal decisions that made little educational sense. Looking to the future, I predict some good news and some bad news. It is time for the public education community to speak out with a loud and demanding voice in order to influence and shape the changing federal role.

The primary goal of federal involvement in the past has been to meet the unmet needs of special populations of students. This is still an important and critical goal of this country.

We've also learned, however, that the perceptions and priorities of those far removed from the education process are not often the best ways to meet the needs of students and often impede progress made by local districts. The advent of federal aid brought mountains of regulations and paperwork. As the federal government began to give out those few seed dollars, they accompanied them with regulations that often determine how state and local dollars are spent as well.

The first change that we now recognize is that the federal government is going to sharply curtail its payment, and unless we speak up we may continue to dance to the same overregulated and overburdened tune. At the same time we're going to have to share more of the cost of the piper.

The future for federal funding looks bleak. The administration has already begun to threaten vetoes unless the amounts authorized for '82 and '83 are reduced. Anytime the Defense Department is in line for multi-billion dollar cuts, you can bet that education is in for additional stringent cuts.

Another complication that's just beginning to surface is increased audit activity on the federal level. Increased rigidity in regulation interpretation while auditing previous programs will result in many more audits. If states are occupied in defending previous audits, they're not going to be so likely to be very vocal about getting more money in the future.

Another potential problem is the introduction of tuition tax credit legislation. The real bottom line in this argument is that the public schools have never had enough dollars to do the job they need for all kinds of students, and until such time as there are sufficient dollars to meet the needs of all students, it seems a strange paradox for the federal government whose primary role has been to meet unmet needs of special populations of students to advocate giving those dollars to private schools which primarily are attended by children of parents who can afford to pay for that kind of education.

Now for some good news. There is the possibility of reduced regulations in several areas. In the education of the handicapped, the administration does seem willing to reduce the burdens of the

regulations surrounding Public Law 94-142. We may also be on the threshold of relief in the area of bilingual education, but relief from federal court decisions is hard to predict.

The final issue that I'd like to talk about is the status of the Department of Education. It appears that the Reagan administration is serious about reducing it from a cabinet level status, but I doubt we'll see a revived HEW. Dismantlement would create more problems for schools than they have now.

It is my belief that public education has met the inherent challenges of educating all of the children of all of the people. It is right and proper that this should continue to be primarily a state and local responsibility. I do not want federal bureaucrats determining any longer what or how my children are going to learn any more than I want the so-called Moral Majority editing or writing the textbooks they're going to learn from. The federal government should provide leadership in looking at the goals of education in this country. It should complement state and local efforts by coordinating research and information. It should continue to meet the unmet needs of special students . . . to meet the special needs of all students.

It's time we all get about the task of guaranteeing that every classroom in this nation is staffed with a well-trained, highly-motivated teacher, one who will challenge the hearts and the hands and expand the minds of this nation's children.

Mr. Jerry Roschwaub, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

The federal government will have a changing role with regard to higher education. Let me explain. Even Common Causes's own members focus their attention on inflation. It reflects what the Reagan folks understand that we don't understand or maybe they don't understand something we've never come to grips with - it is not a mistake what took place in Washington these last couple of months. Groups like ours haven't made education their highest priority - we didn't succeed in convincing our colleagues that this was the principal business of the day.

The federal government has no role with regard to higher education. What it does is fund research projects but not educational processes. We have been crying that the regulations are destroying us because we're involved in a lesser sense in many of the things in which industry is involved. The stupidity of the regulations is where we have difficulty in higher education, not with the regulatory process itself. So far, despite a lot of talk, we haven't seen much change, but we have a President who seems to keep his word.

The reality for higher education is dealing with a dozen different agencies. It has been so since the federal government first became involved with our institutions. The cutback in federal funds will mean changes in student aid without much ideology; the Pell grants and the Guaranteed Student Loan program will be affected sharply. But, the President will have to pay a price - in the short run Mr. Reagan can have anything he wants simply by vetoing appropriations bills because there certainly would be no override - but

he will have to pay a price.

The federal dollar on higher education campuses is a sweetener - it doesn't serve to keep the university afloat. The public institutions of higher education are like post offices; they're political and stay or go on the basis of what state politicians and the people they represent want.

There also are some very positive things happening. A resurgence of military strength will have to come about partly by strengthening the capacity of universities to conduct research and train people. We will see a substantial increase of funds to some institutions to train people in research as a part of increased defense spending.

Dr. Gene Bottoms, Executive Director, American Vocational Association

The cleansing process that is currently going on is just an intermediate step to get the federal government out of support for public education. In terms of the federal role for vocational education, I'd like to dwell on three points.

First, there is a declining federal investment in vocational education. We will be impacted by losses in terms of quality, access, mounting new programs, and in terms of keeping programs current in a changing labor market. It simply means that if states don't replace those dollars, they will have deteriorating programs.

Additionally, there is the indirect loss through loss of some CETA funds, Youth funds, and Adult Basic Education monies - all of which will cut back a state's ability to meet needs, especially with the hard-to-train. There are some housecleaning needs in the broad employment training area: addressing disincentives, raising productive capacities, and refocusing dollars to human development programs.

The second thing I see is a retreat from national leadership that a competent, scientific, technical, and skilled workforce is essential to the nation's economic and defense welfare. This retreat comes at a time when we're having a growing mismatch between people and jobs. We have a growing want ad index at the same time we have growing unemployment. The shortage of technical, scientific, and skilled people will be the major barrier in economic recovery and in meeting our military preparedness goals that this nation will face once we've solved the inflation problem.

Finally, three direct federal actions of the last eighteen months will impact vocational programs and make them obsolete. They are: the domestic energy policies which have doubled the number of oil wells; a tax bill that will retool the basic manufacturing process; and a military expenditure for the Pentagon and defense industries which do not know where they will get the skilled workers for that trillion and a half dollars they are supposed to spend over the next five years. This will result in increased costs for states which wish to compete with the rest of the nation for jobs because labs will have to be retooled, high technology programs will have to be started, and the scientific and technical literacy base of students at the secondary and post-secondary institutions will

have to be raised.

The solution is not to farm out those unskilled folks to the work place. The private sector is not willing to risk expensive equipment in the hands of the untrained and illiterate. The notion that if we remove from government the responsibility for providing essential human services and require individuals to solve their problems in the free marketplace will dramatically impact the development of a skilled workforce.

The current federal efforts will result in weakened institutional capacity; it results in a deemphasis on human capital at a time when we're struggling to ensure that American products can compete in the international marketplace. Walter Heller perhaps put it best in summarizing the missing link in supply side economics: ". . . the Reagan team seems to forget that the real secret weapon of the U.S. economic leadership has been its generous investment in human capital."

I think it is folly to believe that a great nation can remain great without maintaining a viable, public institutional structure to develop the productive capacity of its citizens.

Recorder: John Conway

Education for Unforeseen Circumstances

Dr. William F. Keough, Director
Intergovernmental Services, U.S. Department of Education

Thank you. Governor, ladies, friends, Mr. Drew. I am pleased to be at your meeting. I have heard many good things about the cooperation you tease one another about and I have heard things that indicate that in a growing state, as yours obviously is, it is important that people pull together. I certainly have seen that experience over the years. In talking at commencements this past season, I have found that the best way to explain education to some of the graduates is to simply point out that there are two definitions of education. One that Charles Shultz illicited from the cartoon strip, Peanuts, to the effect that a good education is the next best thing to having a pushy mother. At every graduation, practically every mother stands in the audience and confirms that. The other one is a definition presented in 1964 by one of our educational psychologists/philosophers. He pointed out that education is best described as what is left over when everything we have memorized has been forgotten. I think that this is the product we are seeking; to have something left over when students have been through all of their various experiences.

I am here speaking of experiences. I am here not because I am an educator of thirty years, not because I am a superintendent of twenty years. I am here perhaps because I am the only superintendent you will ever meet who will profess to having been in jail through the twentieth year of his superintendency. In the northeast, in my home state of Massachusetts, we have tax limitation proposals which inevitably will allow some of my colleague superintendents to perhaps experience time in prison if they do not figure out some way to come up with more money.

Whenever we are speaking to students, particularly at this time of year, and to staff and faculty, we always point out that we need to prepare students for a future and for circumstances totally unexpected. I speak to you tonight, a little about an experience which helped me to appreciate what we have been doing in education. The experience, obviously, relates to an outlaw nation, Islamic in its basic philosophy, totally ignoring a section of the Koran which dictates that emissaries of one's enemies should never be held prisoner. That particular experience and what you have seen happening over the last few months have obviously made an impression upon me, upon my life, upon my family. It is indeed an example of Americans having been prepared for the unexpected.

My involvement came about as a result of a weekend trip which ended up as an extended stay in Terhan. I had gone in to remove funds from teachers' checking accounts, at their request, of course. One of the things I never learned in graduate school - which I am very good at now is forging checks in teachers' accounts overseas so that I can get the money out for them. In fact, I learned a lot in

the last two years that I never learned in graduate school. If I had been told in graduate school what I was to experience, I might well have switched professions.

You should know that the people who were in that situation were strong people. They were no different from any group of Americans who might have gone through this whole system for the last twenty or thirty years. They were the economists, statisticians, political analysts, Marine guards, financial people, diplomats of all varieties, intelligence personnel and a school superintendent. The superintendent was there simply by accident having come in for that particular weekend as he had for six other trips in the previous six months from the American school at Islamabad.

My responsibility was for the 4,000 American school pupils not all of whom were in Terhan. There was a tremendous presence in Iran. These people were subject to any of the stress circumstances we have in our schools. There were conditions to adjust to and there were compromises to be made. There are learnings that come out of such an experience. The conditions in Iran have been pretty well described by many people. They were all of what you are hearing and then some. The ugly experiences encountered have been well covered and nothing will be served by reciting them again. As an outgrowth of our experience, we deal only with things we learned.

We learned how to cope. We learned how to get the edge on people who obviously had an advantage - loaded weapons. In my particular case, I was especially equipped to handle the situation because I am basically a teacher and all my life I had wanted what I got. The two or three other people in my cell represented what I always wanted as a teacher, a classic captive audience. Some of my cellmates were young, some were very inexperienced, some of them needed help and there I was in the classic teaching situation. This was my way of coping. Others had different ways of coping. Throughout it all, however, there were people who simply decided that this is the situation. We are here - we wait - we go from day to day - we do not, under any circumstances, subject ourselves to anything that lessens our own feelings of superiority, and, at the same time, we try to convince our captors that they are something less than dogs. This is the classic struggle which takes place when there are two people who are at odds. One is trying obviously to put down the other one.

I found I was in a position to help my friends, particularly my young friends, who tended to flare up and wanted to fight. I could explain to them that for thirty years I had been accumulating little tricks, little maneuvers, little things that students had been pulling on me and they, in turn, should apply them to this particular situation. They learned well, almost too well. Some of them, of course had had difficulty in school and it was sort of strange for them to be constantly taught hourly, but they seemed to relish it. They enjoyed the learning and many have since called my office in Washington to say they are continuing their education. So, in the final analysis, satisfaction for me was knowing that a teaching situation helped me to cope. There is a satisfaction you

get when some day some student comes around and says, "You told me something and I never forgot it." The satisfaction to be gained isn't always from the students themselves, however. It is from the teacher, the educator, the legislator, the official who makes the mode for education positive.

I had an interesting set of commentaries coming to me in Terhan from a teacher in Morristown, New Jersey. Her letters for some reason were allowed through. We weren't allowed our own family letters until family members started to change their names. But I got this lady's letters all the time. She was constantly sending puzzle books and distractions - sending things to keep our minds alert, I guess. A heavy number, I think, was being done on people about the relative degree of stability which people would have in a situation like that. This lady, when I returned a few months ago, had already moved to Tulsa. She explained to me what some of the things are that I know about Oklahoma - that it is a totally different situation from what she had been experiencing as a teacher in New Jersey. I don't believe that she is teaching this year. Her family moved and she is preparing to do something in education, but her explanation of the things that are being done, the attitudes, the positive approaches that are being taken was encouraging. Encouraging in terms of some of the other things that are happening in some other states. So I commend you for that, but I point out to you that it is a good thing - don't lose it, do keep it going.

Do, when you are putting your education programs together, keep in mind that we have certain obligations to ourselves and to our children. Yes, we indeed do have to train them for unexpected circumstances. We indeed do have to train them for education in a totally different world, the world of the third and fourth world nations. Nations with 60, 70 and 80% illiteracy are flaunting American authority and American strength. Nations which have barely been nations and can barely keep themselves organized are constantly feeding the love/hate relationship which they have for Americans. The Iranian situation is a classic example of that. They love our cassette players, they love our video tape recorders, they love our TransAm automobiles, they love everything mechanical and material, but they, in many cases, the terribly revolutionary, radical types, resent our achievements. I did a lot of teaching myself with Iranian students and taught them some things they did not learn in their own school programs. They did not know that Harry Truman had insisted that the USSR pull out of Iran in 1946 and 1947. They weren't allowed to learn those things. It did not fit the ongoing revolutionary school of thought.

The whole problem with many of the third and fourth world nations is that their education programs are not complete enough. Learning is based on memory, on rote recitation which does not foster thinking, creative thinking, or individual thinking. It is simply a repetition of what has happened in the past rather than some anticipation of things that might happen in the future. We, on the other hand, encourage thinking and inquiring. It is a distinctive characteristic of American education. We do explain, we do encourage

the thinking process. We tell them how to write a letter, not what to write.

Letters coming to us, which finally caught up with us in Germany by the way, were the best examples of second and third graders who obviously were being taught how to write a letter. You know, dear so and so. "Dear Mr. Keough, (some of you have heard this), I am Susie Smith. I am in the third grade at the military air base in Holland. I am eight years old and I am in the third grade so I know what you have been through." The American teacher lets that go through with a sense of humor. These are children expressing themselves. Another child wrote and said "Welcome back to freedom, welcome back to the United States, I hope you can get used to it."

Discussions about sanity a little earlier reminded me about that. We of course were starved for entertainment and starved for that kind of attention when we were held in Germany. Another point that needs to be made, which I think is important to our young people: the United States has a State Department that is unexcelled in its ability to anticipate the problems of its own people. There was extreme criticism of our State Department for holding the Iranian captives in Germany for a week. Families had been through so much in the past few weeks prior to the release that the Department did not want us home too soon. The State Department had rooms set aside with video tapes of major news shows from day one. Magazines, newspapers going all the way back were set up in chronological order for us. Every possible attempt was made to get people plugged in quickly to the situation that existed at home and what had been taking place. A lot of thinking went into that. We were told, of course, that we should go into the hospital and register. That is just what we needed. We knew we were home when we were told to get in line and register. We were also told that there were twenty-four telephone lines with direct access dialing. Now, I haven't been an educator for thirty years and it has not slipped my mind that with fifty-two people and twenty-four phones there would be a crunch pretty soon. Of course, I went directly to the phones and didn't sign up until later and was chided for it. I was not supposed to do that! A light chiding was a piece of cake compared to the kind of instruction we had been exposed to during our previous fifteen months.

I have to say to you that one of the strengths that we have as a nation certainly comes through in our schools. It comes in our stories, our comics, our media presentations and in our bantering back and forth. It is a wide open almost sick sense of humor.

We are not all one mix. We are not all Germans, we are not all Iranians, we are not all Italians, we are a mix. The strangest mix going. We are the least likely candidates for a successful society because of our mix yet we seem to have borrowed so much from one another and from the various customs and symbols that exist within our own society. One American who wrote on his jailhouse wall "Stars and Stripes Forever" in Spanish convinced the Iranian students it was the Spanish version of "Hail to Khomeini". A very straight-faced young Marine pointed that out. Our captors would proudly

point out to us that one of our own had written "Hail to Khomeini" in his Indian language. The fellow who did it was a Marine of Spanish descent from Arizona who decided that he would have his version of fun also. This is what kept people going.

No matter what crunch you imagine, whatever crunch comes along, we always seem to do well. It is when we ignore our heritage that we don't do well. Henry Kissinger, in The White House Years, made reference to the fact that in positions of responsibility we are very often tempted to defer a problem, think that a problem deferred is a problem resolved, when actually it is simply only a crisis created. I think that is what is happening to us in present education problems, to be sure. Certainly funding and education funding coming out of Washington are a lot different. If I had my druthers as far as picking a time to join the Department of Education, it probably wouldn't be this particular time. But the Secretary convinced me that he needed superintendents and he needed people with practical experience. In my particular case, I happen to have a good philosophy as an under-secretary who knows the Department and has been a superintendent a great deal of his career. So it was an ideal opportunity for me to plug in and hopefully do something constructive. The first thing they pointed out to me, when I asked "What is inter-governmental relations anyway?" is "You relate to state departments of education, government offices, people in the office who may call, to legislatures out in the various states, to commissioners, to directors of vocational education. You take care of anyone who may call in looking for you to bird dog a problem they may have or check on a project that doesn't seem to be moving through the paper mills. Essentially that is what you do." My answer to that was "What", not knowing the enormity of the job, "do I do after lunch?" The answer was, "After lunch and through the evening, you will answer any calls that may be coming in from the Congressmen." I found out that my boss was right. He knew what he was talking about. He answers the easy ones and he gives me the difficult ones, indicating that I have more time to focus on the particular problem. Besides I had a long vacation anyway, what am I complaining about?

I guess my basic message to you is, know that what you are doing has an impact. It has impact with people who will go into unusual situations and I say to you as I have said all along, I think that the American educational system is so far ahead of any other system we see in the world that we sometimes do not appreciate it as much as we should. It is also very characteristically American that we are not happy with what we have. We want more and in education, that happens to work out well. We want more education, better education, we want more for our money. That is the spirit of the time and it showed while we were held captive.

I think certainly I saw that spirit in every young person among the hostages. They had no question or problem at all about picking up a book and reading it. One time we tricked one of our fellows into reading War and Peace. We told him that it was all that was around. After three days he discovered our deception and stubbornly determined to finish the book. He did so in about a week or two

and declared that not only was it a good book which more people should read but that some day a movie should be made from it! He was a fellow who was superb in math and science and his pleasure was solving problems which Iranian students could not solve.

Books provided a diversion for us and an opportunity to manipulate our captors. The Iranians would come in with English language textbooks which they had taken from the stacks of books I had moved to the embassy. The students were brought up to respond to an autocrat. I used that in our favor by being autocratic about "my" books. I pointed out that they could not, absolutely could not use my books. The books belonged to my school and nobody could use them without my permission. Well, in a deal, the Iranian students were permitted to use the books if we were allowed to read all of the books at the American High School Library. These numbered about 60,000. By coincidence three or four weeks before going to the embassy I had moved all the high school books from the old high school building to the embassy grounds. An act of God, I guess. We might certainly never had come out had we had to sit there doing nothing. It is to the credit of the American system that everybody there could read anything, just sit and read and understand. That is really the measure of what an educational system does. We could see students among the Iranian group who could not read. They were at the university level and they could not read their own language. They had people reading to them. This is how far behind some of the societies are.

Some Iranian students suddenly began to sport eyeglasses. I complained to some supervisor that one of the guards yelled at us all the time. I thought he was deaf and suggested that he be taken to the doctor so he would quit yelling at us, not that we cared, but it was something to complain about. We did not want the guard yelling at us. It was bad enough he pointed a gun. They actually took him to the doctor and two weeks later he came back with a hearing aid. Ordering the students to do something for us worked sometimes. We would tell them to leave us alone or to get out of the corridor. We ordered them to bring us some cassettes so we could hear things. We knew somebody must have sent the cassette for the Super Bowl because I heard that it had been sent. I demanded it and a week later someone came in with a cassette player and told us to listen to the Super Bowl. We sat and got ready, settled down to listen and five minutes later our jailer came back and informed us we had heard it and walked away with the player. Until we got home we did not actually know who had won the Super Bowl! We heard only five minutes of it. It was this kind of maddening situation at which we just had to laugh.

I was commenting to the Governor's wife prior to the musical presentation, I had gone into the washroom and the fine musicians who are sitting up front there now were very busy in the washroom primping and combing their hair and doing all the things that teenagers do. Then they came in and swiftly made the leap into responsible adults. We are dealing with children, we are dealing with children all the way through, sometimes to the age of fifty.

Certainly we had some fifty year old children among the hostages who needed some very specific instructions, but I have to say to you that it never could have happened that way if these people had not had the education they did have. They did not get their spirit, they did not get their confidence, and they did not get their strong egos from breakfast cereal. They did not get it from the air they breathe, they did not get it from television and radio shows. They got it from their homes, they got it from their early training. Their early training was flexible. It taught them to adjust. They can roll with the current and they did. They took instructions from their older colleagues who taught them not to confront but to hassle a little bit at a time. Never create a situation. One young Marine announced to me one night that he was planning an escape. (I have to tell you right away that he did not come from any of my school districts). He was planning to slip over the border into Greece. It is sort of impossible. I found out that he meant into Turkey, not Greece. Someone else straightened him out on the map. That is one thing he learned for sure. His last comment when I saw him last was that he knew where Greece is. He also was one of those we were afraid of in our press conference at West Point. The conference was coming down to the last few minutes and we were afraid that someone was going to come out and say something that perhaps we would not want said, something that would be in bad taste. Someone did ask me that, as an educator, how did I respond to the whole thing. Apparently I had my moment in the sun and proceeded to carry on something awful about education, how different American education is from overseas education and, looking at the faces of the cadets at West Point, I saw something with enthusiasm rather than the faces of anger that I had seen for so many months. When I got back into Washington one of my reporter friends said that as soon as he heard that I got off the plane lobbying for education he figured I had not really changed much. Invariably people will ask of Mrs. Keough once I leave the room, "How is he really?" It has almost become a ritual at social gatherings. Her reply is a standard now, "He is fine, he is just as crazy as before!"

I would like to pass on to you the idea that American education works. Be aware that it works and that we have a changed student population. Know that they understand what happened in Iran. They know that a country was fooling around with our people. I have heard teenagers say this. When we got to West Point I was surprised to see motorcycle gangs wrapped in flags. It was culture shock for me I guess because these were the same types that I had been beating away from the schools back in '68, '69 and '70 and there they were sitting, waving American flags.

We had an experience in Indianapolis. I was speaking to a high school group and after the meeting a young girl came up to Mrs. Keough who was sitting in the audience and asked what influence our experience had had on her. (This was a very neat girl, certainly not very well dressed, but neat and clean and articulate). Mrs. Keough, having been a school teacher long enough to know that the girl wanted to talk about the influence the hostage crisis had on her rather than

on the Keoughs, indicated that it did indeed have an influence on us. The girl then sailed into a story about the whole Iranian crisis which took place in her home. She said that until then her family sat at the dinner table, ate and everyone was quiet. One night she asked her father if they could buy a flag to put on the porch. He told her it would be too expensive. She wanted the flag because it was the flag of her country and other students had flags and she thought their house should have one also. Her father repeated that it would be too expensive and that was to be the end of it. A week later she asked her mother for money to buy a dress. The money came from the mother's tips as a chamber maid at a local hotel. The girl got the money and bought a flag. She came home and announced at the dinner table that she had made the purchase instead of buying the dress. Then there was much discussion about buying a flag and why it was important for her and for people of her generation. The upshot was that if her father did not want to look at the flag he didn't have to - he could come in the back door, but she was keeping it on the front porch. Before Mrs. Keough could control herself and be sure that tears weren't going to come from her eyes the girl disappeared off into the crowd. She wasn't a particularly spectacular teenager, surely not a sparkling star, certainly not a youngster from the upper crust of the community, just the new typical American teenager. They like their country, they are proud of their country. They want to do things for their country and they need the education to help them. I pass this message on wherever I go. I make a deal, generally, with groups like this. I make a deal that I will pass the word on that American education works. It is a time to speak out and say that it works. And the other part of the deal is that people who are responsible for education have to take care of the future. They have to prepare the people who are going into the hills, the rain forests, and the deserts. They have to prepare students who are going under the sea, who are going to look for minerals wherever they might be, who are going to have to deal with the nations of the third and fourth worlds who are sitting on more minerals than we can imagine. They are going to have to be the ones who promote the trade that keeps our country going over the next few decades. That is the deal. I will continue to talk about how good American education is if you will continue to guarantee that it has a future.

There really is not much more I can say on this particular topic. It is an experience few people have the privilege of enjoying. I came back to a country that had totally changed. We were overwhelmed by the changes in our country, the changes in our students, the changes in the people, the changes in attitude and the unification that grew. If all this unification means that we have a stronger nation it also means that the students are more dedicated. It means that some of the mistakes are being corrected as well. If it means all of that then our experience was worth it.

I have enjoyed being with you. Thank you.

Transcriber: Juanita Kidd

Editor: Diane Brown

Achieving Sex Equity in Education

Mr. Dave Renfro, President, Oklahoma City Federation of Teachers, Moderator

I offer my support and the support of the Oklahoma City Federation of Teachers in achieving sex equity in education and challenge each of you to continue increasing the level of awareness for sex equity in Oklahoma schools.

Remarks by Panel Members

Ms. Jean Brody, Member, Oklahoma City Board of Education

I am concerned about instructional materials in the classrooms in Oklahoma schools. There are several things that I think would enhance some change in this area. We must begin to do something about our language - it shapes everybody's thinking. We need to establish guidelines for non-sexist instruction and use them for course content and instructional materials. We need to analyze participation of males and females in courses and extra-curricular activities and begin to remedy the imbalance. We must provide counseling and better information to overcome low achievement expectations for one sex, such as girls in mathematics and science and boys in home economics or office skills. We must offer career education and give it special attention by inviting community members to participate who are not in sex-role stereotyped occupations, and those who are in occupations that have been stereotyped for the other sex. We must have role models in our schools to help both boys and girls set non-sexist expectations for themselves and others.

In summary, the elimination of sex role stereotyping will mean our students, boys and girls, will have the opportunity to develop their potential for participation in this society, and would no longer deprive this country of valuable resources. The elimination of sex role stereotyping is first and foremost a call to improve the lives of women. It is a way to change the expectations women have for themselves, the competencies they develop, and the lifetime choices they make.

Mr. Bruce Gray, Superintendent, Francis Tuttle Area Vocational-Technical School

I feel sex equity is a special challenge for vocational education. Highlighting this challenge, vocational educators have developed the new "Oklahoma Educational Equity Curriculum Guide" which includes: classroom strategies for promoting sex-fair education, promoting sex-fair education through instructional materials, and skills needed for implementing sex-fair education.

In Oklahoma, vocational education has taken several options to

approach changes in sex equity, such as new programs for elementary and middle school students, public notices for non-traditional programs, as well as slide-tape presentations to enhance equitable vocational decision-making at the local level. In conclusion, vocational educators have a vital role to play in the full realization of sex equity.

Dr. Lucille Patton, State Coordinator for the Achievement of Women in Higher Education Administration, Central State University

In the area of higher education, we are indeed challenged to offer more opportunities to women to serve as leaders in all areas of administration. The typical school enrollment is composed of 50% female students. More specifically, we find 53% of the student personnel to be women in the School of Arts and Sciences. As educators, we can readily see the disparity between the number of female students and the number of female administrators in higher education.

A unique way of obtaining a top administrative position in higher education is to join a religious order. A factor which would aid in the advancement of women would be for more women to serve as mentors to promising female leaders. In conclusion, I appreciate the support of State panels which have continued to assist in the advancement of women in higher education administration.

Ms. Glenda Barrett, Coordinator, LEA's Title IX Programs

There is a need for continued awareness of sex equity, specifically in the areas of instructional materials, career education, language, role models, as well as athletics and employment. At the present time, in the area of sex equity we only have federal laws. As professionals in the State of Oklahoma, this is a point we need to consider if Title IX is to have an impact on State schools. At the present time, there is no female superintendent in the State of Oklahoma.

It is difficult for us to perceive the impact of children being raised by single parents. The students of the 1980's are much different than the students of the 1970's. We must be aware of how we reinforce boys "boys" and girls "girls" - for example, on our bulletin boards, in our career education, in our sexist language and our instructional materials. It is mandatory that we start with young children by sharing with them all occupations that are open to them.

As Title IX Coordinator, I have no jurisdiction for enforcement of the provisions of the law. Enforcement is administered through the Office of Civil Rights located in Dallas, Texas. My objective is to offer technical assistance in procedural compliance with Title IX to the schools in the State of Oklahoma.

Panel: The Student's Perspective

Ms. Suzette Northcutt, Legislative Chair, Oklahoma Congress of Parents and Teachers, Moderator

Remarks by Panel Members

Ms. Sandy Smith, Enid High School Senior and Oklahoma Girls' State Governor

Students are not receiving the basic fundamentals of English in their high school English classes and thus are not prepared for advanced English as high school seniors or as college freshmen.

Many of the classes offered in our public high schools are not what the students need, i.e., aerobics. More emphasis should be placed on the basics such as English, math and science. High schools should not have as many alternative courses and thus they could strengthen the basics.

Students should not be allowed to leave school as frequently as they do, i.e., hall passes, work permits.

Nine-week and semester tests should be mandatory so that students will be prepared for higher education. Nine-week test exemptions should not be based on number of absences, grades and tardy rates.

Work permits are given too frequently without formal preparation. Guidelines need to be redefined so that students are prepared for work and don't use these work permits as a tool to attend school for only a portion of the school day. School systems are too eager to grant work permits.

Ms. Deborah Wotring, University of Oklahoma Senior and President of Oklahoma University Student Association

College students are concerned that Oklahoma education is not a top priority.

Public education in Oklahoma is not encouraging students to go to an institute of higher education or to pursue formal work training after high school graduation.

Teacher salaries in Oklahoma are so low that students don't want to major in education. Also, most education majors are female with their top priority being marriage and family.

Mr. Forrest Pollack, U.S. Grant High School Senior and President of the State Future Business Leaders of America

Oklahoma teachers need to lecture more in class rather than assign their students paper work.

Students are not encouraged to participate in school activities such as Pep Club, Future Business Leaders of America and Future Farmers of America. If students participated in these organizations and activities, they would become more involved with their schools.

Career education should begin in the elementary school. Career education is offered too late, if offered at all.

Quality education in public schools and institutes of higher education should not be lowered. Emphasis again should be to strengthen the basics.

Ms. Shirley Coker, Adult Education Student at Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College in Miami

Counseling in Oklahoma public schools is severely lacking. Counselors should have time to counsel and not just make out schedules. Counselors should assist in the principle that every child should have an individual educational plan. Counseling needs to begin in the elementary schools, followed by an expanded counseling department in the secondary school.

Oklahoma teachers need more flexibility. Building principals govern the classrooms--not the teachers.

Recorder: Debra Murphy

Communications Media and Education:
Shaping the Public Attitude Toward Public Education

Mr. Weldon Davis, President, Oklahoma Education Association, Moderator

Remarks by Panel Members

Dr. Larry Zenke, Superintendent, Tulsa Public Schools

If public education is to survive the current blizzard of destructive and demoralizing criticism, we will need to build an ongoing, systematic, two-way communications system between the public and the school. It should be ongoing because one shot fails to build credibility. It should be systematic because the shotgun approach fails to establish direction for long-term goals. It should be two-way because it's as important for us to listen to the community as it is for us to tell them our story.

There are many channels of communication we need to establish as we build this system including advisory councils, community schools, participation of civic groups and volunteer efforts. But, by far, the most effective channel of communication is the news media because it is most efficient in carrying our message to the greatest number of people in the shortest length of time.

Many elements go into establishing credibility. We have a tendency not to believe or even like something that appears too perfect. Therefore, it would not be to our advantage for the press to print only the good and positive about our schools. The public expects us to have problems. In fact, they like us better when we admit we are not perfect. This is especially effective when we share our problems in a positive way along with a range of possible solutions for investigating. Even better, if we can involve our communities in solving our schools' problems, we can quickly bridge the gap between the communities and schools and bring about a unity and togetherness that seems to be lacking in most areas today.

Some do's and don'ts to remember when working with the media are;

1. Learn and respect media deadlines.
2. Get to know the reporters and editors and take every opportunity to initiate them to the background philosophy of the district's goals and problems.
3. Remember that a reporter is an individual with a separate set of experiences and a different outlook on life. He or she will report the facts in the light of those experiences.
4. Don't be too sensitive about being misquoted or a story's not catching the essence you feel it should have. Repetition has far more impact on public attitudes than one sentence or one story. Keep the long range view of school coverage in focus.
5. Develop a climate of understanding and trust with reporters.
6. Learn the process your information goes through before it reaches the public. Reporters don't write headlines. Editing and

headlines are the responsibility of technicians. Don't blame the reporter if the headline is misleading or if some of your most important comments are edited out.

7. Never act secretly or say "no comment", you'll only look guilty. Maintain an atmosphere of openness and frankness.
8. Never go to war with the media.

Recognize the givens in working with the media. The startling news makes headlines and boosts ratings. The positive news probably will not get the play, but with an open and honest relationship with the press it will get some attention.

In Tulsa we try for balance; about ten positive stories to balance a very bad one. We work daily with the reporters to give them leads of some of the "good things going on in Tulsa Public Schools", as my lapel button, which I wear each day to the office, says. After all, if we don't make that effort, who will, or could, or should?

Dr. David Burr, Vice President for University Affairs, University of Oklahoma

I'm going to talk about three words. One is ethics, which I think means you do what is proper. In fact, the dictionary says knowing the difference between right and wrong is one expression of ethics. I also want to talk about credibility and about what is possible.

In talking about ethics, I assume that what we mean by ethics in dealing with the press is that we be as open with the press as possible; and that's sometimes tough. If you are as honest and open as you can be, and you don't hide that little niggling thing you think should be hidden, but you just come out with it, the negative publicity just lasts one day. But if you decide you are going to hide something, you're almost always found out, and when you're found out, it's a story that last longer. Through unethical behavior on your part you have created a negative climate which you did not wish to do in the first place. So it is always better to let the whole truth out even though it may be difficult, and you may get some criticism, but it is over with, and then the public does not remember. You may not always know all the truth, but at least tell all you know.

Credibility and ethics are very much alike. You need to establish credibility with the reporter. If the reporter believes he can get to you, the news source, in a timely fashion and can get the information by deadline; and if he knows you can be trusted, you will have more credibility. If that reporter trusts you, he'll do the best job he can.

Newspapers do not run for the benefit of education. They run for the benefit of the reader and for the benefit of getting as much of the truth out as they can print. I really think the newspapers do a remarkably good job.

It is not possible for them to do a lot of the things for you that you want them to do. There are severe restrictions that they have on what space they can give to anything.

Give media news stories. They don't have to be hot news, but if they are not hot news, they should somehow relate to the public the media serves.

Mr. Jim Bellatti, President, Oklahoma Press Association

One of the first of six principles established by the American Society of Newspaper Editors talks about responsibility. "The principle purpose of gathering and distributing news and opinion is to serve the general welfare by informing the people and enabling them to make the judgments on the issues of the times." Another principle says that freedom of the press belongs to the people, not the publisher or reporter; it belongs to you. Independence to guarantee that what is in the press is the truth, accurate, impartial and fair play, is another principle.

Responsibility is to have an informational piece that is factual and honest. So when you write a public information piece, be sure your facts are straight, or some editor is going to tear it apart.

Sometimes the press is perceived as being anti-education. We hope that only comes in our editorial columns and not in the news columns.

Mr. Tom Jackson, Reporter, Lawton Constitution

I want to say something about the rules we play by. I think there are obligations on both sides. I do think school systems have to make a good effort to provide information to reporters and to answer their questions and provide them the data they need. Access is very important to a reporter.

I realize that a school administrator's most important job is not going to be dealing with the press. He has a school system to run, but access is important.

We have obligations too. First, reporters should be honest and open about what they do. I expect teachers and principals and central office administrators to level with me, and when they are curious about the newspaper I try to answer their questions. I think when a reporter covers a school board meeting, he should play up the most important actions of the board and not the most controversial statements. Many issues in education are complicated to understand, and the reporter must make an effort to understand. If not, I can't expect a principal to spend time trying to explain what he does.

I'll suggest some story ideas you could put your own reporters on. Some of my suggestions have to do with the differences of public and private schools.

Make sure the local reporter knows what you're doing to carry out the provisions of House Bill 1706. It's good public relations to talk about what you're doing to upgrade your staff. It helps to make the point that there is a gap between training and competence for public school teachers and some kinds of private school teachers.

I think you should play up the research resources you have, and make sure the reporter knows what your library system is like.

Try to keep reporters informed of what's happening in your science and math programs. Any unusual and effective method of teaching will make a good feature story. For example, I did a story recently on finger math. A lot of activities that educators take for granted will make a good story. The textbook selection process is something you may not think of, but it is helpful to explain the process. It puts some of the irrational fears to rest. There's always an angle because every year you're adopting something.

With all the talk about the 3 R's, you might want to take the opportunity to tell the public just how many courses you have, and that you don't have any choice in teaching them. You might want to talk about the mandates you get from the Legislature.

It's not the reporter's job to write stories that will please the school system and make everyone happy. It's not a matter of wanting to be negative. Sometimes there are stories that, if you are responsible, you can't pass over.

Recorder: Bonnie McDonald

The Role of Education in Economic Development

Dr. Leo Mayfield, Former Superintendent, Putnam City Schools, Moderator

Remarks by Panel Members

Dr. Larkin Warner, Professor of Economics, Oklahoma State University

There are three points that I would like to emphasize.

First, not only does education play a critical role in the process of economic development, but economic development, in turn, facilitates the expansion and improvement of our education institutions.

Second, the development record of the Oklahoma economy during the past decade has been phenomenal.

Third, the phenomenal record should continue through the 80's, but there are some trouble spots on the horizon with which we must be concerned today.

After a careful examination of the U.S. economic development process between 1929 and 1969, Edward F. Denison concluded that about 35% of the growth in national income was due to "advances in knowledge", and another 15% was due to improved education of the work force. Thus, knowledge and education account for half of total economic growth. For those of us who are bemoaning the current effects of the new federal budget, I would emphasize that the administration's supply-side economics philosophy contains within it the seeds of a massive re-emphasis on support for research, education, and investment in human capital. Indeed, without such re-emphasis, I would suspect that over the long-run, supply-side economics will not solve our serious and chronic problem of lagging growth at the national level.

Economic growth and development also facilitate the expansion and improvement of education. Educational activities which are publicly financed benefit from an expanded tax base; those privately financed gain from greater endowment contributions and expanded ability to cover tuition charges.

Mr. Julian Rothbaum, Chairman of the Board, Francis Oil and Gas Company

The universities in the State of Oklahoma have a fundamental obligation to promote the social and economic development of the State. This responsibility is discharged through the provisions of quality education of the citizens of the State, the advancement of knowledge through research, and the operation of the extensive public service programs. These institutional comments compliment and enhance industry's goals of production of goods and services, the realization of adequate return on investment, and industry's own commitment to public service.

The long-standing mutually beneficial relationship between industry and university is taking on new and exciting dimensions in this period of intense economic development in Oklahoma, especially, as it has

been mentioned, in the petroleum industry. In my brief remarks, I should like to touch on a few of the important aspects of industry and university relations and the underlying implication of economic growth.

One of the university's most obvious contributions to the State's economic growth is the training of highly educated and creative men and women to meet the State's specialized manpower requirements. One of the greatest magnets in attracting industry to the State is the existence of a strong State system of higher education. It should be noted however, that the university's responsibility to provide the highly skilled manpower required by society does not end when the college degree is conferred upon the graduate. The university also provides a multitude of continuing education in public service programs aimed at keeping graduates current on the latest developments in their fields and the development of special skills through short courses and special training programs.

Research is one of the most fundamental responsibilities of a university. Without research, universities would stagnate. Universities perform a greater volume of basic research activity than industry. More than 60% of all basic research in the nation is performed by universities. The lion's share of this research in the past 25 years has been funded by the federal government.

On the other hand, research is vital to industry in order for it to remain competitive in the open market through provisions or better products and services to the public. However, research requires such a critical mass of people and equipment in order to be effective that often industry cannot afford to set up its own programs. Therefore the combination of industry and university resources in a cooperative research relationship can be most attractive.

This university/industry research relationship may take many forms. It may include direct funding of the university research projects or programs, joint research ventures, or company-funded research fellowships. But whatever form it takes, both industry and university reap valuable rewards of cooperative research. The university benefits from the market connection with industry, the access to additional technical and physical resources, the curriculum enrichment from communication with industry, and the additional long-term and consistent funding for research. Industry benefits include the application of research to production, marketing and management practices, the acquisition of special skills, techniques, and equipment available only in the university, increased employee recruitment opportunities, and the opportunity to influence the university's research direction.

Actually, problems that industry faces can provide exciting research challenges to the university researcher. But it must be recognized by both entities that the final choice of research direction remains the province of the individual researcher. Universities and industries can stimulate greater economic growth by combining research resources. The greatest strength of a cooperative university/industry relationship is that it strengthens the private sector and facilitates the solving of problems without depending on government to assume all responsibility.

Simply put, open communications and cooperative relationship between industry and university can improve the climate for innovation. Working together they can stimulate the economic growth of the State, in science, in technology and in productivity.

Mr. Hank Jacobs, Coordinator, Industrial and Technical Services,
State Department of Vocational and Technical Education

As the Governor mentioned in his remarks yesterday, the state-wide unemployment rate in the State of Oklahoma is 3.2%.

However, in the metro areas of Tulsa and Oklahoma City, whereas the nation-wide unemployment rate is 7.2%, you can reserve these figures for the two metro areas: 2.7. Twenty counties in Oklahoma have less than a 2% unemployment rate. Generally speaking these counties are located in the western half of the State. And again, they are related to the oil and the gas industries.

Oklahoma has an out-migration of our most valuable product from 1930 to 1970. This was the exportation or the out-migration of our young people.

Since 1970 we have reversed this trend, and now the Okies are coming back from California with two mattresses on top of their cars.

From 1968 to the present time a division within the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education called Training for Industry (TIP) has served new or rapidly expanding industries.

The success that we've had within the last ten years, particularly in diversifying the economic base, started back in 1968 under the administration of Dewey Bartlett. Bartlett took the first mission to the East Coast to see how the Carolinas and other states along the East Coast were working to attract industries into that area. George Nigh, as Lieutenant Governor, formed what was then known as the Governor's Industrial Development Team. Increased emphasis was placed on attracting industry. Dr. Tuttle was our State Director of Vocational-Technical Education. We have had much success in Oklahoma, and I think a big part of the success that we've had in attracting good quality industries to our state and providing jobs for our young people and upgrading positions for the older worker is that we have had continuity all the way through; and many states don't have this continuity in vocational education. And so we've had continuity for all of these years and tremendous leadership by Dr. Francis Tuttle. The image that the industrial world that is, generally speaking, Chicago, Detroit, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Ohio area, have about Oklahoma is that they don't think that we have a very sophisticated work force in Oklahoma. We've got to turn that image around, and we're doing it. And we're doing it by tailor-made training programs. You know, each facet of education has something to bring to the party on economic development. And I'm talking about higher education. We're targeting high technology industries to try to come into the State of Oklahoma and capitalize on the resources that are at our universities in the fields of electronics, pneudraulics, and pneumatics. Diversify the economic base even further with manufacturing plants not necessarily related to the oil industry. And it's true, the majority of industries

that have come in the last three or four years have been, generally speaking, oil-related. We are the down hole pump capital of the world; of submergible pumps made in the State of Oklahoma. The latest industry coming on stream is Franklin Electric in Wilburton, Oklahoma. It goes along again with the Governor's emphasis to diversify the economic base statewide.

Seventy percent of the new industries that have located in Oklahoma from 11 years in this game have been outside the metro areas of Tulsa and Oklahoma City. And 80% of the new jobs created in the State are by the existing industries. We've pulled out an all-out effort to help industries who want to upgrade the skills of their work forces.

We've done specialized training programs with over 300 new industries that have located in the State in the last 11 years. Over 40,000 people trained in their tailor-made training situation for the job opportunities that became available to them because of the drive that Oklahoma has had in attracting new industrial growth and diversifying the economic base.

Ms. Karen Bearden, Supervisor, Centrilift-Hughes, Incorporated

I'm really from a company that is a result of all of the last gentleman's effort in talking to you about what is happening in the State of Oklahoma. Last year, we did a pre-employment training program from the months of March, 1980 to July, 1980 to help us in setting up a new facility in Claremore, Oklahoma, where we have made available around 550 new jobs. When we moved there last year, in June of 1980, we had a handful of supervisors and a few managers, and that was all. We needed a work force of around 250 new employees from the Claremore area, and we needed them to be able to produce a product to meet our customers' needs. We were part of the Byron Jackson Company; then Hughes Tool bought us out last year, and that is when we started our new facility and our new force. The Vo-Tech helped us in many ways, and I will tell you a few.

One of them was that they secured for us, while we were building our plant, a local training facility, something which we would not be able to do had Vo-Tech not have been helping us with that. They also provided us with the machines for our inspectors and so forth. They also helped to pay for our instructors, and by that I mean that we supplied our own instructors. Our supervisors were our instructors. This was an excellent opportunity for our supervisors to work for 12 weeks with their employees without production over their heads. They could actually look at their employees for 12 weeks. We were under no obligation to hire them. These people got a degree or certificate from the Vo-Tech saying that they had increased their skill levels, and we also had a chance to look at these employees and look at their attitudes and work habits and had a chance to be able to look at their attendance. They came 2 nights a week, 4 hours a night, no pay, and by the way, we had 95% of those people come for 12 weeks, 8 hours a week. We also had a goal, and that was just to give these employees a basic skill level which would provide us a head start in starting up our new facility. We didn't want to bring everyone of

these people on the highest grade level of job classifications. We didn't want to make them all set-up men or all qualified journeymen. We wanted to just increase their skill levels. In fact, we brought a lot of women into the machinist area who had never been in a plant before. To start this out, we trained, or asked for 300 trainees, of which we were going to take about 270. We had 3,000 people apply for 300 trainee positions. We still have an applicant list of around 3,000 active people that want to get into our plant. We prepared a matrix. We identified all of the skills that were in our various jobs that we offered at Centrilift, and then we took those jobs with like skills and developed a program with the help of the Vo-Tech. We taught electrical theory and schematic reading. We taught blueprint reading, math, and shop math in addition to machine operating and so forth. We also taught measuring instruments and how to use measuring instruments, especially for our inspectors or our quality control people. Then we also taught other skills like first aid and CPR. We taught fork-lift driving, and these are just a few of the curriculums that we taught. But, the main point that I want to get across to you is the results are directly related to Vo-Tech's helping us. First of all, 95% of our students graduated. They went for 12 weeks, 8 hours a week. Of those that graduated, we hired 95%. Now this program was set up so that they were under no obligation to come with Centrilift, and we were under no obligation to hire them either. We hired 95% of those that were trained.

Machine shop efficiency . . . when we switched over from the Byron Jackson plant in June of 1980, they were running at approximately 69.6% efficiency in the machine shop. This was our control group. These were people with up to 10 years of experience. We used a new work force. With our new work force, some of which were women and men who had not more than 3 months' experience, our efficiency level in September was 82%. We have been able to maintain an efficiency level in the machine shop now of 92%. This is after only 4 months operating. I talked to our vice president of manufacturing before I came here, and I asked him if I could say that the Vo-Tech was helpful in making us the most efficient shop we have ever been. He said, "We would have probably with on-the-job training alone would have gotten to that figure in a year and a half. The Vo-Tech training department helped us to get to that figure in 4 months and to maintain that figure." What has that done to us in terms of an overall corporation? Well, obviously, no one has to tell you that the oil industry is booming, and as I said before, our sales last year, this is actual versus budgeted, we are running 24.3% over our sales that were budgeted in 1980. These are second quarter figures by the way. That is with the new facility when you are running 70.9% better in sales, you have to be able to meet that demand in manufacturing. That means that you have to have qualified, skilled people to meet that demand. Well, our operating income from last year is up 200.2% thanks to a qualified skilled work force. Now I look at these figures, and I think well figures are that, but what is more important to us is employee comment from the people who went through this program. I went back yesterday and talked to those people that had graduated from this training program, this pre-employment training program, and we've had 5 people

leave our company. We have a turnover of 1.2%. The national average is 5%, by the way. The employee comments were fantastic. Some of them are still displaying their Vo-Tech Certificates of the skills that they obtained while they were in our pre-employment training program. I used to live in Wisconsin, and there I had a chance to work with the Western Wisconsin Vo-Tech Institute. They are a very good institute, but I can honestly say that I have never been in a State like Oklahoma that encourages industry growth and economic development through its education. So, I'd like to kind of close with one more thank you. And that really is to you, all of you. Because you, whether you know it or not, are directly or indirectly involved with industry's greatest resource, its people. Thank you.

Recorder: Fern Green

Implementation of Staff Development and
Entry-Year Teacher Program

Senator James Howell, Chairman, Senate Education Committee, Moderator

Remarks by Panel Members

Dr. Jack Reed, Superintendent, Miami Public Schools

Staff development is the vehicle for needed renewal strategies if the district places a priority on continuing education and improving performance. The goal of structured staff development that is designed to accommodate individual differences is the improvement of competencies. There is a need for an open cooperative effort to encourage change. Extremely important is a supportive environment which is the responsibility of the principal.

Instant change or the expectancy of inadequacy remediation will not be the result of staff development via 1706. The purpose of staff development is to foster personal and professional growth. In addition, district development is the process by an institution to bring changes.

The rewards will be closer relationships, more people involved in decision-making, more collaboration efforts to seek solutions, and inevitably, a more manageable environment.

Attention must be given to specific conditions - commitment, careful planning, and early success.

Ms. Nancy Grubesa, Teacher, Union City Public Schools

The steps for organizing a staff development plan are as follows: committee selection, needs assessment preparation, agreement on a point system, development of a record-keeping system, development of an evaluation instrument, identification of resource people, submission of staff development plan to local board of education, submission of staff development plan to State Department of Education, and communication to teachers of an approved plan.

Ms. Kathryn Woodard, Teacher, Tulsa Public Schools

The initial function of the consultant teacher is to acquaint the entry-year teacher with available resources and to acclimate her/him to the school setting. Therefore, an orientation period should be scheduled for clarification of duties and responsibilities. Observation time is a priority for the entry-year program, and the administrator should actively participate as one of the 3 committee members. The staff could participate to provide the time for a quality experience.

Because of the time involved in adjusting and learning, the entry year-teacher should be assigned no other duties. In addition,

a handbook (guidelines) for consulting teachers should be developed.

Resist eliminating the bargaining agent involvement in submission of names for consultant teachers; weekly sign-off sheets; folders that seek to specifically track activities that could be used for evaluation purposes; and parent conference forms for the beginning teacher (potentially threatening).

The strategy for professional excellence and assisting those entering the profession is to build on success.

Dr. Richard Wisniewski, Dean, College of Education, University of Oklahoma

We must believe that the quality of teacher preparation makes a difference. If we advocate learning for others, we must advocate it for ourselves. Where you get that learning is immaterial.

Ms. Judy Leach should be complimented for accelerating the review of colleges of education and their staff development efforts from 5 years to 2 years. Failure to comply should result in "closure".

Can professionals control entry into the profession? I hope so. HB 1706 is described as the way to assist the profession toward professional status. Abandoning the "sink or swim" attitude will provide a support system and add power to the profession and the classroom. Completion and distribution of guidelines for entry-year committees should be facilitated. (John Folks, State Department of Education, reported that guidelines for entry-year programs will be distributed to superintendents in a month.) With regard to the higher education representation on the entry-year committee, cooperation between institutions in serving on committees near the institution is essential. Educators should allow some confusion time in implementing the program which has the potential for establishing the strongest teacher preparation/induction system in the nation.

Mr. John Folks, Associate State Superintendent, State Department of Education

The role of the State Department of Education is not dictating the district plans but some standardization is needed when staff development in some districts includes taking tickets at ballgames while those same points may require publication in professional journals in another district. If teachers are to be compensated for participation in SD activities, some method of equalization will have to be determined.

Beginning January 15-16 education students who have a minimum of at least 90 college hours and the recommendation of their college will be eligible to participate in the competency exams required for a teaching certificate.

The program is quality teachers in the classroom!

Managing a School System

Dr. Vincent Reed

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education - Designate
U.S. Department of Education

Governor Nigh, Dr. Dunlap, Representative Fried and Senator Randle. It is a great pleasure for me to be here. It is a very good feeling to see a group of people gathered to talk about education. And, as you know, a lot of us who have been in the position of superintendents and also in the Department of Education, we make a lot of talks around the country. It is very seldom you come before groups that are gathered for the purpose of saying, "I want to do something about education and the quality of education."

Ladies and gentlemen, there are 16,000 school districts in this country. In the year 1980-81, \$107 billion was spent in this country for elementary and secondary education. And of those 16,000 school districts around this country, many of them are in trouble financially. And as they move around and talk about those school districts, I can tell you about a school district in New Jersey that was taken over by the state last year because they had gone broke. I can tell you about the school districts in Ohio that closed down three and four months because they could not finance the remainder of the year. I can tell you about a large city in Philadelphia that is espousing now a \$243 million deficit and school starts tomorrow. I can tell you about the large school district in Arkansas that has failed to float a bond a second time, and do not know how they are going to open school day after tomorrow. School districts around this country are in trouble financially. And I have talked to many, many school superintendents and many school people in the community and the legislature, and they tell me that people are sick and tired of paying for education because of the many, many young people we have leaving our twelfth grade. They cannot function at the twelfth-grade level. Everybody says to me, "Why is it that we have so many young people leaving at the twelfth grade across this country and are not able to function at the twelfth-grade level?" And to many of us in the school systems and in the school business we are very defensive about that and we say, "Well, there are many, many young people who leave our twelfth grade and are able to function and matriculate at the largest colleges and universities across this land." But research will tell us that three million people in this country cannot read the daily newspaper. Research will tell us that SAT scores have dropped 49 points on the verbal and 32 points in the math in the last 14 years.

Now the next question is - why is it that it seems that education has got to be something that we don't value in this country and we don't make a priority in this country? It seems to me that we in this country have turned education over to those people other than the educators. And it seems to me that we have got to put education back into the hands of the educators and let superintendents and school

people run school. Now I don't want to stand here and have any hard feelings with Boards of Education. I don't want to have any hard feelings with politicians, I want to get to the airport. But I think we have to take a pragmatic glimpse at where we are in this country and what is happening to us across this land. The average life of a large city superintendent in this country is 18 months. Now, ladies and gentlemen, there is no way possible to walk into a school district, I don't care how small or large, and put a program into place and implement a program of quality in 18 months. And let me tell you what happens when everybody feels they have an input into education. They can run education. Let me go back and change that. Everybody does have an input into education but everybody can't run it. Somebody has to be held responsible for it. And school districts now that are being run by those people other than the people who have been taxed upon are the school districts that I'm seeing in trouble.

We, as citizens and taxpayers of this state and the cities, have to become monitors of the practitioners of education. We have to watch those people who are responsible for running the school system. We have to support those superintendents who have the responsibility of producing education of quality. And make sure that they are allowed to do that on a day-to-day basis. It is not possible for a school board of five, seven, nine, or eleven members to run a school district and be held responsible. The only person you can hold responsible is the superintendent and him or her to have the support of the people in the community. It is not possible to teach a union to run school districts. It is not possible for anyone to run a school district and be held responsible for that but the superintendent and the superintendent deserves all our support. And when you are not the practitioner or the monitors of the practitioner, let me tell you what can happen to you. And I want to get personal about this because I know what happened to the Nation's Capitol. Senator Randle told you about the kind of things that happened in the city that is so affluent and is so heavily involved with a lot of different pressures. I saw Washington, D.C.'s school system go through eight superintendents in twelve years. As the Board of Education played musical chairs with superintendents, the school district slumped to a point where the people who were there and who survived the comings and goings of superintendents became survivors. They were concerned about surviving for very personal reasons and not necessarily for educational reasons. Things got so bad that in 15 years nobody had updated teacher guides. Nobody had moved to put the personnel practices in order that will have a school system of that magnitude functioning on a sound basis. I am talking about a school system with 130,000 students; a school district that had 18,000 employees; a school district that operated 280 school buildings of which you had 16 high schools, 34 junior high schools and the rest elementary schools that just seemed to be floating along as the superintendent tried to survive in fighting the struggle with the Board of Education. When they came to me and said to me, "Tomorrow we are going to fire your present superintendent and we are going to make you superintendent," I said, "Oh, hell, no. At the present time I have got about 21 very good years in the system and I have a record that I think is impeccable

and doggone if you are going to spoil it by making me superintendent."

Let me be very personal again because the president of the Board at that time said, "Well, we are going to make you superintendent whether you want to be or not and you are going to have to serve in that capacity until we conduct a search and we find somebody who will take the job." I went home that night and I was very ashamed of myself because I thought, Vincent, you know what? For years here you are a man who stands and you reject people who don't show dedication to the young people. You talk about those people who don't have the dedication and here for the first time you have a chance to make a vital input into the development of young people and you are afraid to do so. I was very ashamed of that. I had to make a decision that night. Am I going to be another person to stand here and mouth my dedication or was I going to be a person to get into the fire and do what I could do to help those young people develop? So I decided to do that. I decided I would take it on an interim basis and see how it worked out, still giving myself an out if I didn't want to do it. I went into the business of trying to get myself together with it.

We are talking about a school district that didn't know how many people it had. We had superintendents who went before Congress to justify their budget and could not prove the number of employees in the system - those kinds of embarrassing things. The reason I am telling you this, and I am not ashamed about it is because there are other school districts in this country that are at that point. But being at the nation's capitol, we get a great deal of publicity. Somebody throws a brick, everybody knows it. Everybody knows what the Washington Post knows. And the Washington Post is a very influential, very powerful newspaper. The only newspaper I know that could fire the President. I am saying to you that it takes a lot of guts and a lot of faith to take over a school district that has been in that situation.

So we went into it and over a period of time we had drawn superintendents and top echelon people from all over the country. Because the feeling was that the Board of Education always used the term, we want new blood into the system. Well, I had seen so much new blood I was wanting to go with some of the old blood. So I started bringing in people into the system whom I felt really had something to add and people whom I knew had the kinds of talents and the kinds of abilities to make a school system go. And the first meeting I had, they fired my predecessor at 8:30 in the morning, now that in itself should indicate to you that this is a very important matter. I have never seen a Board of Education meet at 8:00 in the morning for anything. They were all there, eleven strong, at 8:00 o'clock. At 8:15 they had successfully fired my predecessor. At 8:20 they had announced me as acting. At 8:25 there was a big press conference. I was sitting in the chair in the front, the Governor and all the Board Members were sitting behind me, and the cameras are flashing. Everybody was there and they were asking me questions: "What are you going to do about this? What are going to do about that?" I am sitting there saying, "I don't even know how in the hell I got here." I am trying to figure out if I let somebody trick me into this. Because I didn't have the

slightest idea what I was going to do or how I was going to go about it. The only thing that I knew was that I had to fire some people. And I didn't have a lawyer at that time. I had no attorney to give advice or anything. I said to the gathering here. "I really don't know too much about what I am going to do." I went back to my old education bag and I made statements like, "I will have to make an assessment of the situation. I will have to put a group together to study it and as they report back to me then we will make some decisions sometime in the near future as to what has to be done." That bought me some time. So I went downstairs to make a list of people that I knew I had to get rid of.

Let me tell you the problem with that. I am talking about people who are friends of mine and colleagues of mine. People who had been in the system for a long time. So I called a friend of mine who is an attorney in town and I told him I didn't have any money, couldn't put him on a retainer, I couldn't do anything but I needed his advice. He said okay. He came down and sat with me for three or four hours. I tried to explain to him the dilemma I was facing. He said to me, "You can't fire these people. Number one, they have not been evaluated. Number two, they have tenure. There is no documentation at all that would stand in court for five seconds. You just can't fire them." I said, "Well, Jim, it looks like you have given me your best legal advice. It looks to me like I have only one choice and that is since I can't go with a legal reinforcement to fire these people, I will have to go another route." So I called them in one by one and I said, "You are fired. I want you to clean out your office by 4:00 o'clock tomorrow evening. If you don't clean out your office I will send someone and have your stuff removed. We have no time to waste, we must hit the ground running at eighty miles per hour." One guy said to me, "Vincent, I am going to take you to court." I said, "I don't blame you. If you were in my position and you came in and told me I was fired, I would take you to court. So that is your next move, because I have made mine." Today eight out of the nine are still good friends of mine. I think some of them were relieved to go.

But I am saying to you, if you are going to turn it around, superintendents and other school people, it is not an easy simple job. It is a nasty job. All of you who have been to Washington, the Board of Education building sits at 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue right in the heart of downtown. Most of the supervisory people and their different disciplines were housed in the building at 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue. It was kind of a joke around town that the top school people in math, science, and other disciplines, would come downtown, check into the office and go shopping all day, if they checked in at all. So the problem was to get people to go to work. Now who is going to be responsible for that? It seems as if the people who were responsible for those people didn't do it in the past. So I thought there was only one person to do it and that was the superintendent. Ladies and gentlemen, all of us think that the superintendent makes big, powerful, milestone, educational procedures. But somebody else makes the educational decisions and you become a

manager whether you like it or not. And if you don't become a manager you don't survive. So every day at 10:00 o'clock I used to take a 3x5 card and put into my pocket and I would walk around downtown in the department stores and everytime I saw somebody who worked in the school system (I have been there a long time and know all the people) I would jot their names down and dock them a day's pay. And if I caught them twice, I would fire them. After about two or three weeks people wouldn't even go to town on their lunch hour. So I am saying, it can be done. Because we knew that our young people could learn and we knew we had to make adults be responsible for teaching young people.

We finally went through all these kinds of things to make sure that people got about the business of education. I am saying to you that superintendent, or that supervisor, or that chancellor of education, needs your support when he takes those kinds of steps and makes those kinds of moves to make education something of quality. We were getting to the point where we had a fire drill everyday when pay-checks came out in the central administration. A twelve-story building and we had eight of them and we had a great number of people working there. Everytime checks would come out there would be a bomb scare called in by somebody. You could put your watch on it. The checks came out at 12:15 to 12:30, and we had a bomb scare. Everybody would empty the building and nobody would come back. So we had to decide what to do about the bomb scares, we couldn't stop the checks from coming. So we set up a policy that once the checks came and once the bomb scare came in and we emptied the building, no matter how long we stayed out for the search, within 15 minutes after returning to the building every department head had to submit an attendance list. Everybody who was there before the bomb scare and was not after the bomb scare lost a day's pay. And if you were absent twice after the bomb scare then we would put you on the unemployment line. So after a while we didn't have anymore bomb scares.

These things don't have anything to do with education, but they are the kinds of things that need to be put into place in order for education to nourish and grow. And I am saying to you that is what we need to do in this country. Then we can stop saying to people, why is it you were not willing to fund education? Why is it that you are not willing to put up the money to pay teachers good salaries and pay administrators good salaries so that our young people can come out of the twelfth grade and function at a twelfth-grade level? The colleges are going broke going back to teaching youngsters how to read and write when they should have learned that in the first twelve years of their education. They can no longer afford to go back and teach remediation and do the job that we should be doing K-12. Before they get to that point other things have to be done. We have to make sure that our teachers are reinforced in the classroom.

In 1969, out of the assistant superintendent in charge of personnel's office, the day before school opened, the day before teachers and students came together, we had 20 vacancies. (I want you to listen to this because it is true.) Twenty vacancies! At the end of the first day the teachers and students came together, I had 169 vacancies. One hundred and forty-nine the first day!

Now we are talking about a force of 8,000 teachers. But that is still a lot of people to quit the first day. One man left at 11:00 a.m. and didn't take his lunch, his coat, or anything else. And I am saying to you that any school district can sink to that point if we do not become the monitors of the practices of education. Especially if we don't turn education back over to those people who are responsible for educating young people.

Boards of Education can't do it. I am a strong supporter of PTA and always have been. I think it is the only viable school group that exists in this country and has been there since the beginning. I support them right down to the bottom line. But they can't run schools either. Schools have to be run by the principals and the support of the superintendent and all the other people that are responsible.

Think about this whole business of how teachers are to look. How people are to act in the classroom, I think has a great impact upon how young people learn, particularly in cities and large urban settings. I walked into a school one time, and I have taken my beatings with these kinds of rules, so don't think I am standing here saying that we came out of this thing smelling like a rose. That is part of one reason why I don't have a job. But anyway, I went to a junior high school one time and there was a teacher standing there turned around writing on the blackboard with a pair of faded blue jeans on, with a big red patch on her posterior. Now there are some people who feel that dress doesn't mean anything to kids. That it has nothing to do with what goes into their heads. I have heard that time and time again. I reject that. I think youngsters need to look at teachers who look like teachers. When I walked up to this lady I said, "Come here, sugar, let me talk to you a minute." I said, "You are not dressed properly to teacher school. Now we don't intend to ask you to pick up any greasy motor parts, we don't intend to ask you to mop any floors, we don't intend to ask you to wash any blackboards, we don't intend to ask you to do anything but teach. Now you are dressed for working in a factory. Now you go home and you put on some clothes that are more appropriate to teaching school." She looked at me and said, "Doctor, with all due respect to you, Mr. Simon, head of our teacher's union said that we could wear anything we wanted to wear." I said, "Well, since you have that much faith in Mr. Simon I will tell you what to do. On your way home you go by and see him because you need a job, sugar." She stood there for a moment and walked down the hall and stopped and came back and said, "I will go home and change clothes." Two weeks later she wrote me the most glorious letter you have ever seen. She said she had never thought about how dress had an impact upon young people. And since I had reinforced that she would never be caught in that situation again. Not just teachers, but some administrators. I walked into a junior high school one time and there was a principal standing there in a red velvet jumpsuit - a one-piece jump suit. And he looked good in it, too. He was a tall slender guy like Senator Howell and looked real sharp in it. I am upset about another thing because he looked so good and I am too fat to wear a jumpsuit. I said, "Come here,

brother, let me tell you something. You go home and put on some clothes. Our kids need someone to emulate. They need to have somebody in front of them they want to look like. They can go down to 14th and "U" street and see a dude dressed like you. So you go home and put on some clothes." And he did. And never again did I have that problem out of him.

I am saying there is more to education than just what takes place in that classroom between the teachers and those young people. And all those things have to be done if we are going to pull education up to the point that people hold it as a prerogative in this country. It is the backbone of this country. It is the backbone of where we are today and we can't afford to see it go down the drain. That is the reason I am very pleased to see the Governor and Legislators at a conference like this and they hit on time. They didn't come here to make a political speech. They came here to be a part of it. So I think Oklahoma is in good shape. But we have to see that it perpetuates itself and has a ripple effect all over this country. We can talk about education and we can talk about giving something that youngsters can buy into. We are talking about focusing upon good strong basic skills programs in this country. And that is what the Office of Education - if I survive any limited time in elementary and secondary - that is what we are going to do. We are not talking about basic skills to replace anything. We are talking about basic skills as a foundation for the pre-K-12 and we are talking about focusing on that and helping the states so that we can have an education program in this country equal to any. I am sick and tired of people holding Japan up to me as the example of what education should be. I don't think anybody in this world should be the leaders of education but those people who have had the most and the longest and in an organized and formalized way, and that is the United States of America. I am saying we can do it. This administration is about the business of taking the government off the local school districts' backs. I support that. I had my fights with education when I was superintendent. I cursed on many a day because of the children in this country that need to be educated. I don't care what configurations the Department takes on, the students are still going to be there.

We used to laugh around the school business about the opening day of school. You better get ready because the kids are going to come whether we want them or not. That's the same thing I say about the youngsters we have in this country. We owe it to our young people to expect them to learn. We owe it to our young people to set an atmosphere where education can survive.

Not too long ago I was called to come to the Hill to testify before a committee on problems in public education. I refused to go because my feeling was that here's another hearing to justify somebody's existence. I didn't want to be a part of that. My school board president and principals said, "You've got to go. You can't deny it." After testifying an hour and a half on education in the cities, John said to me, "Mr. Superintendent, what do you consider your most serious problem right now?" I said, "With 130,000 kids in 280 buildings in this city, I consider my most serious problem

security. He said, "Security?" I said, "Sure, we're having people robbed and people are afraid to come into the building. The youngsters are not safe to come in and out because of the outside intrusions and the Fire Department says you can't lock these buildings. There is a building with 80 exits toward the street and we can't close any of them. I would say security is my most serious problem at this point." He said, "What do you consider a solution?" I said, "Not given any other alternatives, I'd say that we need to have some people at our school to protect the citizens of our system." He said, "Are you advocating guards at our schools?" I said, "Absolutely, positively. If that's what it takes to make sure that if a mother sends her child to school that mother doesn't have to work all day worrying about whether his or her child is going to come home safe or not." He said, "I don't think you can have an educational atmosphere in the schools with guards in the schools." I said, "Sir, I reject the fact that you sit there in a \$380 suit and a \$40 shirt telling me about what the hell goes on in school. I'm not going to take that from you or anybody else. Because I'm the one that the mothers cry on. I'm the one who has to face the mother with a ten-year-old daughter taken out of school this past school year and raped in an alley at 10:30 in the morning. You're not facing that mother and I reject the fact that you sit there and make that kind of political statement to me. We have to be realistic in our cities about what has to be done to protect our youngsters, to be realistic in our cities as to what has to be done to educate our children and we owe them an education." He didn't take too much objection to that. He called me on the phone the next day and asked me if we could sit down and talk, and we did. I said to him, "If I embarrassed you, I'm sorry, but you embarrassed me when you insult my intelligence when you make that kind of remark to me. I live with it everyday when a child six years old doesn't come home until 5:00 o'clock in the evening and everybody in town is looking for him. You don't live with that. We live with that. That's real when that mother's child is not home."

I'm saying to you that we have the problem of education so we need to control education. I've never seen a board of education for our community people. Boards of education fire superintendents. It seems to me if we're going to be fired for our lack of leadership, or inability to produce quality, we ought to have all the problems and everything that goes with that. Your superintendents and your school people need your support. You have it here. No question about that. I think of our young people whom we take twelve years of their lives and we produce them out of the twelfth grade and they are not able to function on the twelfth-grade level; they're going to make a living off of us, ladies and gentlemen. You better believe it. If we don't give them the tools by which to make a living, they're going to make a living off of us, and the monies that we should've given to teachers for higher salaries, we'd better take that money and hire policemen because we're going to need them. Because if we don't furnish them the equipment by which to make a living they're going to take to the guns, or other ways of making a living. Which means that all of us ought to get out of here before dark and get inside

and lock our doors to make sure nobody harms us. We don't want that kind of society. We don't want a police state. We have an opportunity now not to have one by educating our young people. I think we have to become the monitors of this - the practitioners of education. We can't turn that over to anybody else. I want to say, thank you, and I put on my superintendent's hat because I feel so strong. I'm so much in support of superintendents and principals because I think sometimes they find themselves out there alone when the chips are down and decisions have to be made.

I had a good Board of Education and I don't want to stand here and make you think I didn't. I had 11 people and 3 of them were very, very good people. That's pretty rare, but my whole feeling about it was that since we know from research that the average life of a superintendent is 18 months, and you go into that job knowing that you only have 18 months you may as well do your thing while you're there. And do what's good for the children.

Let me say another thing. Our test scores went up drastically. If anyone had spent any time in Washington they could attest to the fact that our test scores went up drastically. We did away with social promotions. I didn't listen to the rhetoric that people gave about it being psychologically damaging to fail youngsters in the first five grades. My feeling was that they could adjust because, when we turn them out in the twelfth grade and they are walking around alive for the rest of their lives, not being able to function, not being able to produce, is more damaging than flunking somebody down pre-K-12.

We have to set standards for education. We have to make sure that our youngsters have to meet standards before we pass them on. We can't play games with them. We have to make sure that they are there and that social promotions don't prevail and they are moved on not because of age and maturity, but they are moved on because they have reached certain levels of competency. I think we owe that to our young people. We cannot be pushed into a corner by these people.

The thing that I think in this country that is dead at this particular point is busing. If we are not worried about busing, and my philosophy was that I thought busing was necessary because there were some facilities in the cities that were more conducive to education than others. When you bus kids who were not in the more conducive physical facilities to where it was more conducive everybody could get a good, solid sound education. Now, if busing exists, for all intents and purposes, then I think we better turn our attention to quality and produce quality wherever we find the young people. Do not use it as an excuse for not educating our young people. With a school district of 130,000 kids, as we had in Washington, 97% of those kids black, we don't have time to talk about busing. If I was going to bus any white kids, I'd go to Chicago and get them. But I am determined, regardless of that situation. In spite of the kids that are deprived, we are going to produce quality education and we are going to make sure that the money that we have is spent for educating children. We were furnishing 49,000 free breakfasts every morning and from 70,000 to 79,000 free lunches every day which meant that 49,000 of our kids ate two meals a day at school. For a

while we gave them free shoes, brand new shoes, I don't mean used shoes. You get a slip, you go downtown. They set you down in the best shoe shop in town and they fit you up and they give you a pair of shoes, new clothes, new eye glasses, all your dental work taken care of and our kids could not read. Now, I'm saying we have got to understand why we exist in education. We are not a social agency. Now I don't want anybody to leave here saying that Vincent Reed is up there working with the Office of Education and he is not concerned about the welfare of children. I'm saying absolutely we are concerned about the welfare of children but those social needs ought to be taken care of by social agencies other than the school system.

As for this whole business of special education, we spent \$27 million last year for special education alone. We were paying something like \$60 to \$70 for one child in an institution. When I started looking into that we found out that maybe only \$10,000 was for the purpose of education and the other \$69,000 of that total bill was for the purpose of taking care of residential kinds of things, so I went to the Mayor and said, "Listen, you have got to pay these residential fees, I'll pay the educational fees." He says, "I'm not going to do it." We took him to court and beat him. Which didn't prove wise in the long run because I had to go to him for my budget. But the point is, stand up and be counted and let people know that you are about the business of education.

My hat is off to the superintendents, principals and teachers and all the other people who are out there everyday fighting these battles. And when you feel like you are at the end of the line, you can look at that kid, when he or she is make a contribution, it makes you think it is all worthwhile.

Editor: Diane Brown

Planning Committee
For The
1981 Oklahoma Conference on Education

Arch Alexander
Jo Bazhaw
Leroy Bruce
Irvine Castleman
Bari Catherwood
Mary Cherry
Ramona Emmons
Tommy Fulton
Ferm Green
Jim Harris
Bill Hodges
Gerald Hoeltzel
Juanita Kidd
Hershel Lamirand
Rick Lane
Joe Leone
Karen Leveridge
Patty May
Leo Mayfield

Bonnie McDonald
Anthony McNeal
Linda Moore
Suzette Northcutt
Peter Pierret
Pierre Peloquin
Forrest Pollock
Dick Poole
Dave Renfro
Pete Rhames
Jack L. Robinson
Fred Shultz
Roger Smith
Nancy Virtue
Barbara Ware
Ila Whitsel
Kay York
Larry Zenke

Conference Staff

Barbara Blevins
Retha Duggan
Mary K. Foster
Vicki Foster
Jamie Hilbern
Suzette Northcutt

Otie Ann Patton
Pam Punneo
Carolyn Smith
Norma Speegle
Debbie Terlip

Proceedings edited by Diane Brown

Special recognition is given to Arch Alexander, Mary Cherry, Juanita Kidd, and Ila Whitsel for their assistance in preliminary editing of Proceedings of the 1981 Conference on Education. Also, thanks goes to Pam Punneo for typing the proceedings.